

5¢ a Copy • No Advertising • \$7.50 a Year

46773

B-5-60 SCHL
HIGH
WASH
UN

Current History

JULY, 1961

FOR READING TODAY . . . FOR REFERENCE TOMORROW

WEST SEATTLE HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARY

Government and Education in the United States

What Is Government's Role?

GOALS OF AMERICAN EDUCATION	<i>George N. Shuster</i>	1
EDUCATION IN COLONIAL AMERICA	<i>Robert Middlekauff</i>	5
AMERICAN EDUCATION AFTER THE REVOLUTION	<i>William G. Carleton</i>	9
EDUCATIONAL PATTERNS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1865-1914	<i>Ann M. Keppel</i>	15
PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1918-1945	<i>Harry V. Barnard and John Hardin Best</i>	22
HIGHER EDUCATION TODAY	<i>Gerald P. Burns</i>	28
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION TODAY	<i>Clarence Hines</i>	32
SECONDARY EDUCATION TODAY	<i>C. A. Hauberg</i>	41
CURRENT DOCUMENTS		
Administration Memorandum on Federal Aid to Private Schools		49
RECEIVED AT OUR DESK		51
Federal Aid to Education: A Selected Bibliography		52
THE MONTH IN REVIEW		54

OVERNIGHT ONLY

Current History

Founded in 1914 by
The New York Times

Published by
Current History, Inc.

Editor, 1943-1955:
D. G. REDMOND

JULY, 1961

Volume 41

Number 239

Publisher:

DANIEL G. REDMOND, JR.

Editor:

CAROL L. THOMPSON

Assistant Editor:

JOAN L. BARKON

Promotion Consultant:

MARY A. MEEHAN

Contributing Editors

ROSS N. BERKES

University of Southern California

SIDNEY B. FAY

Harvard University

MICHAEL T. FLORINSKY

Columbia University

HANS W. GATZKE

The Johns Hopkins University

NORMAN A. GRAEBNER

University of Illinois

OSCAR HANDLIN

Harvard University

STEPHEN D. KERTESZ

University of Notre Dame

HANS KOHN

City College of New York

NORMAN D. PALMER

University of Pennsylvania

CARROLL QUIGLEY

Georgetown University

JOHN P. ROCHE

Brandeis University

A. L. ROWSE

All Souls College, Oxford

HARRY R. RUDIN

Yale University

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

Williams College

RICHARD VAN ALSTYNE

University of Southern California

COLSTON E. WARNE

Amherst College

Book Review Editor:

ALVIN Z. RUBINSTEIN

University of Pennsylvania

85 cents a copy: \$7.50 a year.
Canada \$7.75 a year. Foreign in-
cluding the Philippines \$8.25 a year.

Coming Next Month...

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

August, 1961

The August issue concludes our 3-part study on the role of government in education. Nine specialists discuss the problems of American education and debate the question of federal aid:

THE PROS AND CONS OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION by *Van Cleve Morris*, Professor of Education, Rutgers University, and author of "Philosophy and the American School";

FEDERAL AID FOR PRIVATE AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS? NO by *Leo Pfeffer*, National Director, Commission on Law and Social Action, American Jewish Congress, and author of "The Liberties of An American";

FEDERAL AID FOR PRIVATE AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS? YES by *Neil G. McCluskey*, S.J., Dean of Education, Gonzaga University, and author of "Catholic Viewpoint on Education";

FINANCING PUBLIC EDUCATION by *Seymour E. Harris*, Professor of Economics, Harvard University, and author of "Economics of New England";

PHYSICAL PLANT PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION by *Chris A. De Young*, Professor Emeritus, Illinois State Normal University, and author of "American Education";

SEGREGATION IN AMERICAN EDUCATION by *Henry J. Abraham*, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania, and co-author of "Elements of Democratic Government";

THE TEACHER SHORTAGE by *Otto Krash*, immediate past president of the Middle Atlantic Philosophy of Education Society and Associate Professor of Education, Stern College for Women, Yeshiva University;

REGIONAL PROBLEMS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION by *Austin Swanson*, Research Associate, Institute of Administrative Research, Teachers College, Columbia University; and

EDUCATION IN THE STATE OF HAWAII by *Hubert Everly*, Dean of the College of Education, University of Hawaii.

ATTENTION DEBATERS!

Other issues in our series on the N.U.E.A. debate topic for 1961-1962 on government and education are:

GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION ABROAD (6/61)

GOV'T AND EDUCATION IN THE U.S. (7/61)

Published monthly by Current History, Inc., Publication Office, 1822 Ludlow St., Phila. 3, Pa. Editorial Office, Wolfpit Rd., Norwalk, Conn. Entered as second class matter May 12, 1943, at the post office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Individual copies may be secured by writing to the publication office. No responsibility is assumed for the return of unsolicited manuscripts. Copyright, 1961, by Current History, Inc.

What is the traditional relationship between the federal and state governments and the schools in the United States? The articles in this issue trace the development of American education and evaluate the position of elementary, secondary and higher education today. In our introductory article, the former president of Hunter College explores education's traditional goals, and suggests that "... in view of constitutional and other restrictions, it would be in the best interest of public education to seek viable ways for securing better community cooperation between public and private institutions."

Goals of American Education

BY GEORGE N. SHUSTER

President Emeritus, Hunter College

OF PUBLIC EDUCATION in the United States one may say that while it seems destined, granted the usual provisos in terms of war and peace, to have a much more exciting future than it does a past, it still has history enough to make a short piece about it seem as likely to succeed as would an effort to squeeze Ireland's annual rainfall into a single afternoon. In order to manage at all, I shall cite no statistics, get away as agilely as the circumstances permit from discussions of educational philosophy, and avoid as often as I can sketching portraits of those who have most directly influenced our development.

Publicly supported education at all levels was not the result of a commitment to the state as the proper arbiter of instruction, as was the case in the France of Napoleon Bonaparte, nor did it come about primarily by reason of the secularization of religious establishments. Education was the creature of necessity. American religion, it is true, made a valiant educational attempt. Almost all of the States east of the Mississippi still maintain a network of religiously affiliated schools which go far back into history and must not be confused with the contemporary system

of parochial schools. By 1860, for example, a state like Indiana was dotted with preparatory "academies" both Protestant and Catholic, most of which have continued to prosper subsequently, though few have grown notably in size and opulence as they were transformed into colleges or universities.

Obviously, however, these institutions could not meet the educational needs of all the people in all the communities. In particular, the cities as they grew had to settle down earnestly to the task. We should, of course, note that there were theoretical commitments to the idea of universal education as a proper function of the state. Jefferson in particular, who may have been influenced in this respect by the French Encyclopedists of the seventeenth century, tried to give this concern the status of law both at the Constitutional Convention and in his native State of Virginia. He did not succeed in either attempt. Whether there were to be public schools supported by taxation, and how they were to be managed, were left pretty much to the local communities. But soon enough the several states were in part financing and regulating instruction. And the federal government itself was, through the

well-known Northwest Ordinances of 1785 and 1787, actively aiding public education.

These Ordinances said in effect that as the territories were opened up to settlers about one-third of the public lands were to be set aside for educational purposes. It is true that these generous provisions remained on paper until 1803, when Ohio was admitted to the Union. But it had been recognized that education costs money, and that in this instance the federal government had some to give away. While the Civil War was raging, President Lincoln signed the Land-Grant College Acts, otherwise known as the Morrill Acts. These provided that any state thereafter admitted to the Union would receive 30,000 acres of public land in each congressional district so that colleges of "agriculture and mechanic arts" could be established and supported. Accordingly, the pattern of higher education in the newer states has come to differ notably from that traditional in the East. It is only recently that the University of Massachusetts has begun to grow at an incredible pace, moving into the backyard of Amherst College and seemingly threatening to extend almost as far as Mount Holyoke, while universities like those of Illinois, Wisconsin and Nebraska have already reached impressive dimensions.

It is only recently, too, that these developments have to some extent been offset by the increase of the religiously affiliated schools. Of these the Catholic parochial, high school and college system is by far the largest and most complex, but impressive growth has also taken place in terms of the Protestant and the Jewish populations. Two flourishing Jewish universities have come into being in the East—Brandeis and Yeshiva—and the number of lower schools serving the Lutheran Church also grows constantly larger. Therefore one should perhaps take note of the reasons underlying this change.

Originally private schools conducted under religious auspices were usually not looked upon as serving their own constituencies exclusively. In my part of Wisconsin, it was taken for granted prior to the Civil War that Protestant children were as welcome at establishments like that founded by nuns at Sinsinawa as were Catholic youngsters; and indeed many attended without undergoing, as far as one can tell, any form of religious

brainwashing. And conversely there were Protestant schools to which Catholic children went as a matter of course. This changed, partly because of a sudden outcropping of religious controversy in the middle of the nineteenth century, and partly by reason of the fact that lines were drawn less on religious than on racial grounds. Thus German Catholics in Wisconsin imported Sisters and built their own schools primarily because they wanted to keep the German language alive.

All this means that the initial controversies about education and religion had very little to do with the Constitution or with newer doctrine concerning Church and State. It had become vitally important, in the minds of parents and their pastors, not to accept a jot or tittle of religious teaching from somebody not a member of a given Church—even when that teaching was almost precisely the same as one would have given oneself. What a furious to-do there often was because the Protestant was accustomed to add a bit of a doxology to the Lord's prayer! There was no way out of reducing the clamor except to decree that religion in any form was not to be taught. This the States did one after the other, mostly through edicts incorporated into their constitutions. The ultimate results have sometimes been bizarre. In certain places, it is, as Kenneth Hansen has observed, almost worth a teacher's life to refer to the Ten Commandments. And in some states a parochial school pupil cannot be accepted for treatment in a bright new public school speech and hearing clinic!

Even so the lines of separation thus tightly drawn tend to disappear in higher education. Religious organizations and chaplaincies flourish on almost all university campuses; and indeed these may in time make it seem undesirable to maintain all but a very few denominational institutions at that level.

It is rather over the issues of segregation that controversy rages at the moment. The pressure of Supreme Court decisions has, it is true, broken down barrier after barrier in theory. But although it is now possible almost everywhere for a Negro child to enter a school established exclusively for whites in the South, doing so is socially extremely difficult, nor is the situation easier at the

college or university level. It will take a long time to cross this bridge as it assuredly must be crossed if the ideal of American equality is to be served.

Meanwhile this ideal has played a stirring and striking part in the schools particularly after the rise of totalitarianism impressed American teachers with the great need for concepts of human rights and duties. Though the result—a notable measure of agreement concerning the specific goals and characteristics of our society—has been under attack as productive of “conformism,” it is difficult to believe that matters would have improved if picket lines established by competing extremist ideologies now formed outside the schools—even as they once did, during the 1930’s, in New York. On the other hand the idea of a “common school,” that is, one which offered the same education to everyone entering the “school community,” could not be maintained under attack in the name of “quality” which became particularly determined after the Russian success with rockets. This assault was directed in large measure at the high school.

To a certain extent the controversy has a long history. It was waged at Columbia University’s Teachers College, once the forge and anvil on which ideas about education were hammered out, between two doughty professors, John Dewey and William Bagley. On the elementary school level there was constant warfare between the progressives and their conservative opponents. High schools were divided between a great majority favoring a “common” curriculum and the supporters of academic high schools such as Hunter and the Bronx High School of Science in New York. In the colleges the dispute was first of all between President Eliot of Harvard, advocate of the elective system, and the champions of the more or less fixed liberal arts program. The universities in their turn winced under Robert Hutchin’s barrage against vocationalism. Today certainly, at the high school level especially, the “common” curriculum is breaking down in favor of “tracks” which will in the first instance select students who have aptitudes for college study and wish to prepare for that.

It is important to note that in no case has there been a clear cut victory for one side or

other. The schools at all levels have done a much better job of sifting good results from experience than they are usually given credit for. Progressivism, for example, has left its mark on the elementary school though its most zealous advocates of the days of yore might think their best ideas had been watered down. And in so far as the college is concerned, the liberal arts have won the argument though electives have not been forbidden completely. A sincere tribute is therefore due to the flexibility of the American approach to education.

Meanwhile, to be sure, the cost of schooling has become a matter of almost overriding importance. If we think only of the universities and technical schools, it has become obvious that the great public institutions of California, for example, have grown to such size and affluence that they can attract scholars from even the most heavily endowed private universities of the East. Though the situation in the Middle West and the South is not yet so favorable from the point of view of public education, it is none the less a fact that a School of Engineering like Purdue commands resources which grow more impressive with each new day, while the university system of Michigan permits of a measure of experimentation in all fields which few privately endowed institutions can any longer afford. The improvement in the secondary and elementary schools is perhaps less marked but is none the less real.

One consequence is that the difference between more prosperous and less prosperous parts of the country becomes more pronounced. The state of Alabama cannot provide for education in the relatively lavish manner in which Connecticut, for example, does. The question therefore arises to what extent can and should the federal government seek to redress the balance? The question has to be placed first of all in an historical context. Older Americans believed in local control of their schools, and to a certain extent this belief is still cherished. But the trend has certainly been towards consolidation and therewith towards strengthened state management. Some states still cling to the older formula, but in others local control has almost disappeared. Even so, a proposal to move all the way to a federal system would no doubt be opposed.

Therefore the national government has moved slowly, though the list of its benefactions has grown. The most important of these may be cited here. The Smith-Hughes Act, the George-Barden Act, and the George-Deen Act made possible grants-in-aid designed to foster types of vocational education of which the nation was thought to have particular need. Thus the George-Barden Act made possible the training of guidance counselors for the schools. All of this legislation was carefully designed to avoid possible federal control of education. Grants were made to the states, which were required to "match" in one way or other the federal assistance given. More ambitious possibly was the National School Lunch Act of 1946, which supplied to the schools, through the states, surplus food commodities. This is, to be sure, calculated in the first instance to improve the lot of the farmer, but now benefits the school youngster to the tune of more than \$65 million a year of federal money alone. Finally, one should consider the measures taken to benefit college and university education. The G-I bill provides the most elaborate program of scholarships ever created, and the Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act make possible student and faculty travel abroad on a scale hitherto unknown. Yet no doubt the assistance given to our institutions of higher learning through the National Science Foundation dwarfs all else that has been done.

But these measures do not attack the problem to which allusion has been made—the problem of the equalization of educational opportunity for young people, regardless of the State in which they happen to live. It is too early to tell what the fate of the measures proposed by the Kennedy administration will be. Manifestly these have rendered more acute the traditional debate between public and private education. The protagonists are now more evenly matched in numbers than they would have been some years ago, but in the meantime the public has become more accustomed to federal aid than it used to be. Segregationist thinking and emotion also play a part.

Whatever the outcome may be, it is apparent that the costs of education are mounting steadily and that the burden is already very heavy. Unavoidable increases in ex-

penditures for defense and social welfare mean that if education is also to be served the citizen will have to be taxed still more heavily, unless the easy way out, through expansion of the national debt, is taken. Some years ago I suggested that in view of constitutional and other restrictions, it would be in the best interest of public education to seek viable ways for securing better community cooperation between public and private institutions. One way would be the sharing of certain peripheral facilities, such as playgrounds and libraries. But the most radical proposal I made was to provide that educators teaching in accredited institutions, public or private, be emancipated from federal income tax payments, provided they had tenure. This would constitute indirect federal support of all education and would not be, so far as one can tell, unconstitutional.

At any rate, public education in the United States has an illustrious history which, however dotted with problems and controversies it may be, is one which the citizen can survey with pride and humility combined. Legitimate pride is dictated by the fact that not only has illiteracy been removed but also that the number of young people receiving higher education is larger than it has been in any country. It may be that the Russians have enlisted more students in the pursuit of engineering and technology studies, but it is illusory to suppose that their achievement comes near rivalling ours.

Humility is, however, suggested by the thought that there are important tasks we have not performed. We do not have educational equality. In many places the ratio between pupils and teachers is unfavorable. Many teachers are not well qualified, nor is their training always what it ought to be. We shall hope for future improvement.

George N. Shuster was president of Hunter College from 1939 to 1960, and is presently assistant to the president, University of Notre Dame. He was director of the Fund for the Republic, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1954. His books include *In Silence I Speak* and *Cultural Cooperation and the Peace*.

"... *Variety in support, in sponsors, in state participation, and in the forms institutions assumed characterized colonial education,*" notes this historian, who explains why educational development in the colonies "followed an uneven course."

Education in Colonial America

BY ROBERT MIDDLEKAUFF

Instructor in History, Yale University

WHEN AN American colonist discussed a "public school," he was not talking about the institution familiar to us since the nineteenth century; usually he simply meant a school open to anyone who wished to attend. The chances were that the school was privately owned and financed. The designation "public" was given to distinguish it from a school catering exclusively to a special group—usually a religious sect.

Indeed, the modern idea of "public education," implying a state-owned system of schools, supported by taxation, and administered by officials chosen by the community, which compels attendance of all children within a certain age group and which carefully separates itself from the educational efforts of private groups, did not exist in the colonial period. To be sure, the state sometimes participated in organizing and financing schools, but its role (outside of New England) was small. Instead, several other agencies assumed the burdens of education; chief among them were the family, apprenticeship, and private schools of various sorts.

Of these institutions early in the colonial period, the family carried the greatest burden. In the primitive conditions of settlement, other agencies did not exist. Parents had to give their children education—if any was to be given. Frequently, of course, children went untutored or picked up rudimentary vocational training while they were working.¹

The family continued to be an important

center of training even after colonial society developed. For colonial parents, like their English forefathers, frequently placed their children with other families for rearing and training. They had good reasons for doing so: some did not trust themselves to discipline their own children vigorously enough; others, wishing to see their children acquire certain skills, apprenticed them to masters capable of providing the appropriate knowledge.²

Throughout most of the colonial period, indentures, as the apprentice agreements were called, usually enjoined the master to see that his charge was taught the essentials of the Christian religion and to read and write. Apprenticeship, of course, was never simply an educational instrument. A master taking on a young boy or girl expected his charge to work as well as to learn. The indenture always provided that the apprentice would obey and serve his master for a specified time, usually seven years or until the apprentice reached twenty-one. The instruction a boy received was always in return for this service. Sometimes apprenticeship proved to be only an agency of work, as masters refused to teach their boys. In such cases, the apprentice's only protection was his parents—or the local courts.

Schools in the first years of settlement were

Robert Middlekauff has been studying the educational history of eighteenth century New England for the last three years.

¹ Bernard Bailyn, *Education in the Forming of American Society* (Chapel Hill, 1960), pp. 15–16.

² E. S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family* (Boston, 1956), pp. 37–8; and *Virginians At Home* (Williamsburg, 1952), p. 23.

scarce in all the colonies. Scattered settlement and scant resources discouraged attempts to maintain schools continuously. Thus in the first years education in schools was largely a temporary, even sporadic affair.

Education in the South

If education in the first years of settlement was much alike in all the colonies, it took on regional characteristics as colonial society matured. In the southern colonies—Virginia, the Carolinas, Maryland and later Georgia—where population always remained scattered on farms and plantations, geography prevented a neat structure of schools. Yet children were educated. A wealthy planter sent his sons to England to sit in one of the great grammar schools, or brought a tutor to the plantation, where he lived with the family. Smaller planters and farmers, especially in Virginia, sometimes combined their resources to build a “field school”—a building in a tobacco field, hence the name—and to hire a teacher to instruct the children living nearby. Boarding schools usually established by an ambitious college graduate or itinerant schoolmaster appeared late in the colonial period and were usually found only in the larger villages like Williamsburg or Charles Town.³

Tutors, field schools, boarding schools, were all maintained without any reference to public authorities. This was not true of most of the endowed schools of the southern colonies. Founded through the generosity of private donors, these schools were usually managed by county or parish officials—or a combination of both. Such officers found a place for the school's meeting, hired its master, and supervised its operation.

The most renowned of these institutions were the Symmes and Eaton schools. Both were founded around the middle of the seventeenth century from bequests of Virginians. Both were controlled by a board of trustees composed from county and parish

officers. Symmes school secured incorporation in 1753; Eaton in 1759. During at least a part of its history each offered instruction in the classical languages as well as in reading, writing and arithmetic.⁴

Altogether nine such schools in Virginia survived at least a part of the colonial period. All in all, they were not of great importance for they took root in only seven parishes; eighty-three parishes had none.⁵ In the colonial South only the grammar school at the College of William and Mary consistently received public funds.

The Middle Colonies

The southern colonies were not unique; contributions from public treasuries in the middle colonies—New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey—rarely were given. Even Philadelphia and New York, large cities in the eighteenth century by English standards, did not direct municipal revenues into education.

An energetic and self-conscious denominationalism supplied Philadelphia with schools. First on the scene, the Society of Friends established elementary schools and a single grammar school shortly after Pennsylvania was settled. William Penn gave his encouragement by bestowing a charter on the grammar school in 1701. The Friends apparently needed no official endorsement, and throughout the colonial period they gave the schools vigorous support through private subscriptions and legacies.⁶

Other religious groups as eager as the Friends to preserve their identity and to perpetuate themselves maintained schools in Philadelphia. An Anglican parish school was begun in 1698, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel supported a charity school for poor children for most of the period before the Revolution. The Lutheran church opened a classical school around the middle of the eighteenth century, and the Baptists followed with the same type in 1755; the Moravians—never a rich group—began an elementary school in 1745.⁷

Besides these efforts—and probably equally important—were the numerous private school masters of Philadelphia. The average private master displayed a variety of skills to Philadelphians. If his newspaper advertisements accurately stated his qualifications, he

³ Morgan, *Virginians At Home*, pp. 8-32.

⁴ G. F. Wells, *Parish Education in Colonial Virginia* (New York, 1923), pp. 32-39.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

⁶ Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness* (New York, 1955), pp. 123-24, 283; and *Cities in Revolt* (New York, 1955), p. 174.

⁷ Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness*, p. 284; *Cities in Revolt*, p. 174.

could teach everything from arithmetic to astronomy—including Latin and Greek, rhetoric, oratory, logic, navigation, surveying, bookkeeping, higher mathematics and natural science. His offerings were necessarily broad; he had to attract students since their tuition provided his sole means of support.⁸

New York, the other city of the middle colonies, could not match Philadelphia's denominational offerings. Still, its religious groups were important agencies of education. Under the Dutch in the first half of the seventeenth century, the Reformed Church maintained a school. After the English took over the colony in 1664, the church, in an attempt to hold its children to the old ways and to the old language, opened several more. Though English culture eventually washed out the results, these attempts helped preserve Dutch homogeneity for years. As in Philadelphia the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel also proved active, sponsoring charity schools for children of the poor.⁹

New York could also boast numerous private schools in the eighteenth century with masters, judging from their claims in the newspapers, no less talented than those of Philadelphia. But on the whole, education was neglected in New York. Perhaps the most auspicious development of the pre-Revolutionary period was the opening of a grammar school by the newly-founded Kings College in 1762. The college and its school promised to renew interest in education beyond the elementary level.¹⁰

Small towns and villages in the middle colonies lagged badly in education. A few parish schools struggled along in several; private masters taught reading, writing and arithmetic and occasionally vocational subjects like surveying; apprenticeship supplied most of the skilled crafts. If a boy desired advanced training in the languages or higher mathematics, he had to travel to New York or Philadelphia. By the late colonial period apparently there were many boys who sought such instruction, for the city schools were filled with students from the country.

The New England Area

This brief treatment of the southern and middle colonies suggests, perhaps, that a variety of agencies—each for its own purposes—promoted education. In New England a number of the same forces appeared: the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel sent out masters instructed to bring the dissenters back to the true faith; Baptists, Quakers and other religious groups strove to maintain schools purveying learning and their versions of Christianity; and in large towns and cities, private masters giving classical and vocational training flourished. Although this was in the familiar colonial pattern, New England, in education as in much else, departed from the familiar. The state made the difference by entering the field of education in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and (before it merged with Massachusetts) in Plymouth.

New England was settled by Puritans who, unlike some of the radical sects they left behind in England, valued education. The Puritans came to the New World imbued with a sense of mission. They had left the Old World to complete the Protestant Reformation, to demonstrate that they held the true conception of church polity and religious doctrine. The success of their task depended in large measure, they were convinced, on an educated community. Hence they wished to erect a system of schools equal to the task.

They wasted no time getting started. Six years after the Great Migration of the faithful began in 1630, the Massachusetts General Court set Harvard College on its distinguished road. Erecting and financing schools proved a difficult task (as did financing the college for that matter) and after a period in which private contributions were relied upon, the General Court of Massachusetts decided to compel towns to assume the burden.

Towns of at least 50 families, it decreed in 1647, must maintain a reading and writing master, and those of at least 100 families, a grammar master—as one who taught Latin and Greek was often called. Responsibility for enforcement of the law was placed with the county courts which were empowered to fine offending communities.¹¹

⁸ Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness*, pp. 447-48.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 123-26, 287.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 287; *Cities in Revolt*, p. 174.

¹¹ S. E. Morison, *The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England* (New York, 1956), pp. 65-78.

With the exception of Rhode Island, the other New England colonies followed the Massachusetts' example, though requirements and enforcement varied from one to another.

The statutes compelled local authorities to provide education; they did not force parents to send their children. Nor did the laws require communities to support their schools from taxes; finance was left entirely to the community's discretion.

Under the laws a pattern of control and finance appeared among New England villages. In its meeting—the most important institution of local government—the town handled the school in about the same way it did any public business. This was a fact of enormous importance, for, so located, the school could not avoid the impact of local politics and of public financial pressures.

Though the town meeting formulated school policy, it depended upon a committee (chosen in the meeting) or the selectmen (the most important officials chosen by the meeting) to carry it out. School committees and selectmen were usually the best men available—men who had education and political experience.

Committee functions varied little from town to town. Usually the committee hired the schoolmasters, found a place for the school to meet if a regular building was lacking, and handled the finances of the school. In most towns how the committee went about hiring a master was its own business, though it did have to satisfy the meeting. In Massachusetts a statute added another requirement: the local minister with one of his brethren, or any two neighboring ministers together, were supposed to approve the schoolmaster before he was hired. Though evidence is lacking, towns seems to have observed this statute. Only rarely did cases of noncompliance get into the county courts.¹²

School Expenses

As local taxes on polls and property provided most of the money for ordinary expenses, so also they provided school expenses.

Only in Connecticut could towns look to the provincial government for consistent financial help. Connecticut towns received an annual contribution out of provincial taxes, but few, if any, found this subsidy large enough to meet the expenses of their schools.

In every New England colony, there were towns which could rely on public lands for part of their school expenses. Donated by individuals, the colony, or set aside by the towns themselves, these lands could be rented or sold. Shrewdly invested, the income from such lands could often relieve the taxpayers of a large portion of school charges.

One other source of finance for schools existed—the parents of boys who attended. They could be assessed tuition for every child they sent to school and until the middle of the eighteenth century they occasionally were. In Watertown, Massachusetts, in 1700, for example, six pence a week was collected for each Latin scholar, four pence for a "writer," and three for a "reader."¹³ Few towns required tuition payments but many insisted that parents provide firewood in the winter. Parents also purchased paper, pens and schoolbooks for their children.

Town growth intensified financial problems and created new difficulties. As its once compact population increased and spread out, a village saw its single school become inadequate. Far from the original settlement, children could not attend the once centrally located school. Nothing, of course, prevented a town from providing a second more accessible school—nothing except money. To soften the clamor for education that arose from remote areas, many towns decided to uproot their schools and send them out on the road. The school might "go round with the Sun" as it did in Duxbury, Massachusetts, for many years, meeting successively in the four quarters of the town for three months at a time.¹⁴

Putting the school on the move had the obvious disadvantage of spreading learning very thin. A boy who had attended the school for nine or ten months out of a year when it was located in one place might only be able to attend the moving school the three of four months that it was near his house. If he was determined he might follow the school as it traveled from one spot to the

¹² This paragraph is based on an examination of manuscript court and town records.

¹³ *Watertown Records* (6 vols., Watertown, 1894-1906), II, 132.

¹⁴ *Records of Duxbury, Mass.* (Plymouth, 1893), p. 320.

(Continued on p. 14)

"Up to the Civil War, the federal government had shown little concern for education," writes this historian. He observes that "... in a number of ways education in all parts of the United States, including New England, worsened in the decades following the Revolution."

American Education after the Revolution

BY WILLIAM G. CARLETON

Professor of Political Science, University of Florida

Educational Conditions to 1825

PROVISIONS for formal education in America in the period following the American Revolution were miscellaneous and inadequate. By 1800 there were 24 colleges in the United States, most of them denominational. But in that year, all told, these colleges probably did not have more than 100 faculty members, 1500 students, or property worth one million dollars. Students, mostly from the upper classes, were prepared for these colleges by private tutors or in Latin grammar schools, which in New England still had some town support but elsewhere were privately conducted.

Those above the pauper classes, but not being prepared for college, got the rudiments of reading, writing, spelling and arithmetic, as well as religious and moral training, in their homes, in church schools and in private schools. Most of these private schools were mere "dame schools," that is, kept in a kitchen or livingroom by some woman who had picked up a little "book learning" and who undertook to instruct children in the neighborhood whose parents could afford to pay a few pennies a week for each child sent to her.

Most of the New England states, following the example of the Massachusetts legislation of 1647, required each town to maintain "a teacher of reading and writing." The towns obtained money for these schools from land endowments, license taxes, and rate-bills. But by the time of the Revolution, the decline of Puritan zeal had caused many of these town schools to fall into disuse, and

in actual practice many New England communities had come to depend upon the dame schools.

What of the children of the masses, the children of the illiterate and the poor? Their parents could not teach them and could pay no church tithes or rate-bills. Neither could they afford the few pennies a week for the dame school. Consequently, most public attention was concentrated on pauper education, for it was felt that the children of the poor should be rescued from "corruption, lewdness, and blasphemy."

Church tithes were set aside for the education of the poor, private subscription lists were circulated, philanthropic school societies were founded. The state, county and local governments obtained funds from land grants, lotteries, and license taxes (particularly liquor taxes) to subsidize pauper children in church schools, private schools and dame schools, or to subsidize the separate pauper schools established by private subscription lists or philanthropic school societies. Sometimes a town or city would build a school building and let it rent free to a private school-master on condition that

William G. Carleton is author of *The Revolution in American Foreign Policy*, published in a revised and enlarged edition by Random House in 1957. He has written numerous articles on domestic and international politics for periodicals in the United States and overseas.

he admit pauper children without charge. After 1800, towns and cities increasingly maintained public schools for pauper children. These were segregated schools, and only the children of the poor could attend.

In general, the educational practices just described represented some deterioration in the conditions which had prevailed prior to the Revolution. Indeed, in a number of ways education in all parts of the United States, including New England, worsened in the decades following the Revolution. The endowments and charities maintained by the Crown and by wealthy individual American Tories had been cut off by the Revolution. The benevolences and schools of the Anglican Church declined. Even before the Revolution, the increasing heterogeneity of the population and the decline of the old Puritan impulses to education had made it increasingly difficult to maintain the town elementary schools and the Latin grammar schools in the New England states. Over-all, the weakening of the old established churches—Anglican and Congregationalist—and the proliferation and increasing memberships of the dissenting sects, many of which had no church schools and little educational tradition, resulted in a decline in organized religious aid to elementary education. More and more Americans had come to live on the country's expanding and broadening frontiers or were living only a generation removed from frontier conditions, and as settlers plunged deeper into the interior they had less respect for learning and for European and Tidewater ways.

Why were Americans of the late eighteenth century and the early decades of the nineteenth century so little interested in maintaining formal educational institutions for their children? It must be remembered that as late as 1820 there were only 13 cities of 8,000 inhabitants or over in the whole country and that these "city" dwellers comprised only about five per cent of the country's population. The overwhelming majority of Americans lived on scattered farms and in isolated villages. Young people learned farming, livestock tending, meat-curing, food-preserving, sewing, rude carpentry, tool mending, hunting, trapping, and fishing from the older members of their family. In the towns and cities, one learned

a craft or trade by being apprenticed at an early age to a master. Economic conditions, then, did not bring any widespread popular demands for education. The earlier religious urges to learn to read, in order to understand the Bible, were weaker than they had been as the population became more heterogeneous and more dispersed over America's amazingly growing back-country, and as the dissenting sects grew, with their emphasis on exhortation, evangelism, and camp meetings, rather than Bible-reading.

The Great Educational Awakening, 1825

Beginning about 1825, a great educational awakening began in America, and during the following decades, particularly in the 1830's and the 1840's, decisive educational battles were fought which laid the firm foundations of America's system of free, tax-supported, democratic and non-sectarian schools.

What were the causes of this great awakening? Some were economic. The American economy was becoming less agrarian and more complex. Commerce and industry were expanding. Improvements in transportation and communications—more roads, the canals, and then the early railroads—were bringing communities closer together and stimulating the exchange of goods and services. The 13 cities of 1820 increased to 44 by 1840 and to 141 by 1860. The factory system was gradually superseding the domestic system of manufacturing. The apprentice system in the towns and cities was beginning to decline. The taxable wealth of American communities increased.

Some of the causes were political. The property qualifications to vote and to hold office were being abolished in state after state. Political democracy and universal white male suffrage were coming to be the order of the day. This was the age of Jacksonian democracy, when more and more offices were being thrown open to popular election and more and more voters were taking part in the elections. The idea grew that if the mass of people were to govern then the mass of people must be educated.

Some of the causes were in the growing heterogeneity of the population and in the multiplication of religious sects. Immigrants

grants continued to pour in from England, Scotland and Ulster, and in the 1840's came the great tides of German and Irish immigration. Would not the public schools be a means of uniting America's diverse populations and of giving them an understanding of American ways? Dissenting religious sects continued to proliferate in America itself, and European immigrants were bringing with them additional ones. Because of this widening religious pluralism, it was becoming increasingly clear that no religious denomination could be favored, that education in America, if it were to be supported financially by governments, would have to be non-sectarian.

Some of the causes were more specific and immediate. The steam printing press came into use in this period, and with it the first modern newspapers at a cheap price. For obvious reasons these newspapers favored increasing the number of people who could read, and they waged campaigns for public schools. As newspapers became more common, they stimulated the desire of individuals to learn to read. Again, the methods of the Lancastrian school were being introduced into more and more localities in America, and under this system a teacher would teach his bright pupils the lesson for the morning, and then each of these pupils in turn would by rote teach a group of ten or twelve of his fellow pupils. By this method large numbers could be taught at relatively little cost. Although this system soon died out, it remained long enough for the advocates of free schools to convince much of the public that mass education at government expense would not be too costly.

During the 1830's and 1840's, leaders in the fight for public education were busy on scores of fronts. Their battle cry was: "The wealth of the state must be used to educate the children of the state." The two most influential leaders of the free school movement were Horace Mann in Massachusetts and Henry Barnard in Connecticut and Rhode Island.

However, it must not be supposed that the proponents of free schools had an easy time of it. Opponents vigorously fought them every step of the way. The forces ranged against free schools were led by the aristocratic classes, the conservatives, the

heavy taxpayers, and those who supported or had vested interest in the church and the private schools. Inertia, too, was on the side of the opposition.

Opponents of public schools asked many questions and used a variety of arguments. Was not education a private responsibility, and was it right that parents should be relieved of this responsibility by the state? Would not free schools rob citizens of their self-reliance? Was it fair, they asked, to tax one to educate the children of another? Was it just that a person who had no children or few children should bear the expenses of a parent who had many children? Was it honest that the wealth of one community should be used to educate persons in another community? Was not this whole idea of public schools dangerously levelling doctrine, French Revolutionary egalitarianism? Would not the state use the schools to indoctrinate? Would not pupils be forced to listen to teachings contrary to what they had learned at home? What about religious and moral instruction? Would not the public schools be godless schools? Could Americans afford the outlandish cost of public schools? Could politicians manage so big an undertaking and could they be trusted with such "huge" funds?

In spite of the formidable opposition, the proponents of public schools won, in large part because the deeper historical forces in America were operating in their favor.

Because the coming of political democracy was an important factor in the establishment of free schools, it is often assumed that it was the Jacksonian more than the Whig politicians who led the fight for public schools. This is erroneous. Very often the Jacksonian politicians who fought valiantly to extend the franchise took little or no part in the fight for public schools. In general, the liberal wing of the Whig party led by such men as William H. Seward and Thaddeus Stevens joined hands with the Van Buren-Locofoco liberal wing of the Democratic party in the battles to bring free schools to the Northern states. If any one group is to be singled out as being in the vanguard in the fight for public schools, it would be the transplanted New Englanders in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin. In terms of party

politics, these transplanted New Englanders were Whigs more often than they were Democrats.

The Battles for Free Schools

Outside of New England, where the tradition of public support of town schools went back to the mid-seventeenth century, the entering wedge for public support of schools was the public aid given to paupers and to pauper schools. By the 1830's, because of the spread of democratic ideas, the pauper school system came increasingly under attack. It was said that this system was a direct inheritance from English rule, belonged to a society based on classes, and was completely out of place in a republic founded on the doctrine that all men are created equal. It was also argued that to educate part of the children in church and private-pay schools and to segregate the poor in pauper schools, with the brand of pauper made plainly evident to them, would create a society of definite classes and endanger America's developing democratic institutions.

The fight to abolish the pauper school system and to establish public schools for all children came to a head in Pennsylvania in 1834 with the passage of the Free-School Law. This law created in every ward, township and borough in the state a public-school district. Each district was ordered to vote on the acceptance or rejection of the law. Those accepting it were to organize free schools for all, while those rejecting the new law were to continue under the old Pauper-School Act. The fact that this new law was optional with each district shows that there was still much resistance to free schools. Some localities accepted the law and others rejected it. It was not until 1873 that the last school district in the state accepted the new system.

The fight against the pauper-school system reached a climax in New Jersey in 1838, when the state instituted a partial system of free public schools. In 1844, the new constitution of New Jersey limited the income of the permanent school fund exclusively to the free public schools.

The victorious fights in Pennsylvania and New Jersey against the pauper-school system virtually marked the end of that system in

the North, for it was in these two states that the system had been most highly developed. However, the pauper-school system lingered on in Maryland, Virginia, Georgia, and at various places in other Southern states until the educational reorganizations which took place following the Civil War.

The death of the pauper-school system did not make American schools entirely free. In some of the New England states it had been traditional to use rate-bills as one device to get revenue for the town schools. As "free" schools spread in New York, it became a practice for some of the poorer school districts to rely on rate-bills to supplement their revenues. It also became a practice for the poorer districts in New York, and in some other states, to use rate-bills to get enough money to keep their new public schools going the three or four months required by state law to be eligible for state funds. These rate-bills were charges against the parent sending children to school. The charge per pupil was small, but it was enough to keep many poor children away from school.

The most bitter fight to abolish rate-bills took place in New York. In 1849, the New York Legislature submitted to the voters the question whether rate-bills should be abolished and the public schools made completely free. The voters by a big majority endorsed the principle of entirely free schools, but the opposition was so intransigent that a second referendum was authorized in 1850. Proponents of entirely free schools won again, but not so decisively. Rate-bills were retained, but state appropriations for public schools were greatly increased, so that the number of districts which resorted to rate-bills sharply declined. It was not until 1867 that the state of New York abolished all rate-bills and made its schools entirely free. These fights in New York were widely publicized in some other states and helped them eliminate this vestige of undemocratic education.

The people of the new states west of the Appalachians had little sympathy for pauper-school systems and rate-bills, and they were not encumbered by the undemocratic practices of the past. Every new state, beginning with Ohio in 1802, received from the federal government each sixteen

section of the public lands for the support of common schools, and two townships of land for the support of a state university. The older 16 states did not share in these grants, so most of them had to set about providing a permanent school fund of their own. Even in the new states the federal land grants were not adequate for the needs of public schools.

By far the most important battle for free public schools in the United States was waged from about 1825 to 1850 in all the Northern states, the old Eastern and the new Western ones, to secure enough revenue to put public-school systems on a going basis. The old sources of school revenue—land grants, lotteries, license taxes—were plainly inadequate if all children were to be given free schooling. Proponents of free schools had to convince a majority of their fellow citizens to submit to direct taxation—state, county and local—for the support of schools.

Here and there, progressive communities had secured from the state legislatures permission to tax their residents directly for the support of schools, but now fights were waged to pass state laws which would *compel* the localities to tax directly for school purposes. When once the state itself was allowed to tax directly for school purposes, then it made its grants to localities for school aid contingent on the willingness of the localities to levy direct school taxes. A common prerequisite for the receiving of state aid was that the localities match state school funds with local funds. Other prerequisites were that the localities drop rate-bills and maintain a minimum school term, usually three or four months. With these devices for maintaining state supervision of the schools, most of the states established state boards of education or state superintendents of public instruction to enforce them.

In the first years of general state aid, some states distributed portions of the school funds among private and church schools, and even after more public schools were established, some state aid continued to go to church schools. In many Eastern states, church schools at first shared in the city funds. However, the question of whether this violated the principle of separation of church and state arose. As the heterogeneity

of the population increased and with it the multiplication of religious sects, there were quarrels about what constituted a fair sharing of public money among the various church schools. Then too, those denominations which had no church schools resented public funds being spent on church schools of other denominations. The question was made more acute by the large migrations of Irish Catholics and German Lutherans into the United States in the 1840's. In New York, in 1842, opposition of the Protestant churches to giving public funds to the Catholic schools resulted in cutting off public aid in that state to all church schools. This action by New York stimulated some other states to cut off public money to church schools. Thus conflicts among the churches themselves hastened the development of the non-sectarian public-school system, and the public schools were left in exclusive possession of the school revenues.

As for secondary education, the decade from 1820 to 1830 saw the rapid development of the academy, which represented a transition from the old Latin grammar school to the American high school. The Latin grammar school took children at an early age and prepared them for college by concentrating on the ancient languages and the classics. The academy, unlike the Latin grammar school, did not run parallel to the lower grades but was built on top of them, thus helping to develop a one-ladder democratic system rather than a two-ladder class system. The academies also widened the curriculum to include algebra, astronomy, chemistry, botany, general history, American history, surveying, declamation and debating. Besides being forerunners of the high schools, the academies supplied the expanding public-school systems with their best teachers. The academies were privately owned and students paid tuition, but some of the academies received aid from public funds.

As the public-school system spread and as more young people completed the eighth grade, there was a growing demand for secondary education. Why should parents be made to pay private tuition to give their children a secondary education? Why should they even be required to pay rate-bills? These and other questions increas-

ingly were asked, and the idea grew that the free public schools should be extended upward through the twelfth grade. The movement to establish public-supported high schools began in Massachusetts and New York in the late 1820's and the early 1830's. In the late 1830's, in the 1840's, and in the 1850's, it spread from these states to other Northern states. It found a ready response in the new Western states. However, in some Northern states, including Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Jersey, the high-school movement did not really get under way until after 1865, and in the South it did not come until even later.

The rise of the state university to a place of importance in American education did not occur until after the Civil War. By the end of 1860, there were 246 colleges in the

United States, but only 17 were state institutions. Most of the colleges were denominational colleges. Only the University of Michigan foreshadowed the great future that was before the state university, for in 1860 Michigan enrolled over 500 students.

Up to the Civil War, the federal government had shown little concern for education. Aside from its land grants to states admitted to the Union after 1800, the federal government stood aloof. However, with the Morrill Act of 1862 the federal government extended aid to land-grant colleges for agricultural education. In 1867, the office of United States Commissioner of Education would be created. And in 1883, the prophetic Blair bill would raise in a large way the question of federal aid to the states for the common school.

(Continued from p. 8)

next. But this was such a difficult and expensive process that probably few boys did it.

If many towns sent their schools into outlying sections, an equal number divided themselves into districts and established a school in each. Usually citizens in each district elected a committee charged with responsibility for hiring a master and providing a place for the school to meet. The authority of the district, and its committee, rarely included more important matters. Towns continued to hold taxing powers and understandably enough were reluctant to share them. Every town allocated annually a portion of its revenues to districts on the basis of their populations. Such divisions were often contested by jealous districts, but on the whole the system worked well.

The success of the system left Rhode Islanders unimpressed, and their legislature steadfastly refused to establish educational standards for its towns. The results for the colony's intellectual life were obvious: in the seventeenth century only one Rhode Island boy attended college. In the next century more traveled to Harvard and Yale but no college took shape in Rhode Island itself until just before the Revolution.¹⁵

Yet there were publicly-supported schools in Rhode Island, even a few which offered instruction in Latin and Greek. But most of these schools were in towns which had been

transferred from Massachusetts to Rhode Island on the settlement of a boundary dispute in 1747. Thoroughly imbued with the educational tradition of Massachusetts, they probably never considered dropping their schools in removal from the Bay Colony's jurisdiction.

For the most part, Rhode Islanders relied upon private sources for the support of schools. Often this means failed them; and their schools, compared to those of the neighboring colonies, enjoyed a precarious existence.

Rhode Island's educational history obviously parallels much of that of the southern and middle colonies, where no public commitment to education existed and no private source of support was ever entirely reliable. In no colony did one group monopolize education. Rather, variety in support, in sponsors, in state participation, and in the forms institutions assumed characterized colonial education. Inevitably educational development followed an uneven course.

It did because it was an expression of a colonial society, which was altering at an uneven pace. Education itself, of course, was a force in this process of change. As it helped shape colonial society, so also was it shaped. What emerged by the end of the colonial period was a peculiar blend of public and private, classical and vocational, religious and secular. Modern "public education" had not yet been conceived.

¹⁵ Morison, *Intellectual Life*, p. 70.

In an examination of the growth of public education on all levels, this author writes that "far more remarkable than accumulated statistics was the altered spirit prevailing at all points in American education by 1914. In adjusting to the industrial and scientific, the social and intellectual revolution within the nation, the schools themselves were revolutionized."

Educational Patterns in the United States, 1865-1914

By ANN M. KEPPEL

Assistant Professor of Education, University of Vermont

IN THE 50 years between the Civil War and World War I, American education altered profoundly. This was a period of extended public support and, consequently, of remarkable growth in numbers of institutions and students. More important, schools and colleges assumed a multiplicity of tasks not previously considered within their domain. Paradoxically, although American public education surpassed that of any other nation in the world in scope and imagination, it was attacked as too narrow, too traditional, and inappropriate to the times.

In response to the varied demands of a complex, heterogeneous society, the schools and colleges hesitantly but certainly reflected the fundamental changes in the economic, social, and intellectual life of the nation. America refashioned its education and, in the process, produced schools and colleges vastly different from their pre-Civil War predecessors.

Between 1865 and 1914, the United States transformed itself from a nation primarily agrarian to one heavily industrial and highly urban. By 1890 the "frontier" had officially ended and, although more Americans still lived in rural than urban areas in 1914, the ratio was about to be reversed.¹ A new wave of immigration replaced the old. Southern

Europeans swarmed to our shores to join a mobile native population concentrating in industrial centers. All were absorbed into a dramatically expanding economy.

Optimistic Americans had little doubt of the inevitability of progress as they exploited a rich supply of natural resources, crisscrossed the country with an intricate transportation system, and built an industrial economy within an urban society. Relatively free of international crises and rapidly awakening to a position of world power, the United States enjoyed a period of economic growth and stability.

There were inevitable dislocations. Labor unrest accompanied the depressions of the 1870's and 1890's, and the beginnings of a labor organization with a sustained history emerged. Rural discontent led to the formation of the Grange, the Alliances, and ultimately to the politically significant though short-lived Populist party. At first, it seemed that even these dissident elements accommodated themselves to *laissez faire* individualism. The American Federation of Labor moved cautiously within the established

Ann M. Keppel held a university fellowship for three years at the University of Wisconsin. She has taught at the University of Illinois (summer, 1957) and is teaching at the University of Wisconsin this summer.

¹ Twelfth Census of the United States: 1900, *Statistical Atlas*, Washington: United States Census Bureau, 1903, p. 40 states, "While the aggregate population has increased rapidly from census to census, the urban element has increased proportionately much faster than the aggregate population." By 1920, more people were officially living in urban than rural areas according to *Fourteenth Census of the United States, Statistical Abstract*, 1920, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1923, pp. 74, 86.

framework of the political and economic structure and the anguished cries of the farmers gradually subsided. Even the new immigrants—the Poles, the Russians, the Hungarians and the Italians—somehow made the painful transition to a new language, a new political structure, and an entirely new way of life.

But the voice of protest and reform was never silent. When, particularly after 1890, it appeared that the triumph of business, wedded to politics, stifled rather than released further individual opportunity, progressivism swept the country. Probing critics who found injustice and corruption demanded immediate and long-range reforms. By the first World War, the progressive movement was virtually over, but it had produced the muckrakers and social settlement workers, a Theodore Roosevelt and a Robert La Follette, and an array of municipal, state and federal laws touching the lives of all Americans.

For our schools it was an equally exciting span of years. By any established criteria, schools grew in number and influence. The 37 per cent of children from ages five through 17 who attended school in 1870 increased to 55 per cent in 1914. The annual expenditure per child rose and schools were in session more days per year in both rural and urban regions. The average monthly salary of teachers, still sadly low, nonetheless soared from a mere \$16.60 in 1870 to \$46.50 in 1914. A declining illiteracy rate of 20 per cent of the population in 1870 to 6 per cent in 1920 demonstrated the basic accomplishment of our schools. The number of colleges doubled with the result that more students graduated from college in 1914 than had completed high school in 1870. Formal education profited from America's growing wealth.

Although the principle of free, non-sectarian, publicly supported schools for all was so deeply embedded as not to be revoked, no organized *system* of education existed in 1865. Even in states where the common schools were free and numerous and where the statutes provided for a state university, the status of the high school—the logical link between them—was precarious. Initially, a variety of private and semi-public academies, seminaries of learning, and scat-

tered public high schools feebly filled the gap. By the end of the era, however, the high school, supported and controlled by the public, had come of age.

Emergence of the High School

The trend, particularly after 1870, was for state legislatures to authorize districts to establish high schools, to encourage them with financial aid, and finally, to require the more densely populated towns and cities to provide them. Formal schooling was not only directly available to more students for more years, it was obligatory as well. In 1890, compulsory attendance laws in 31 states and territories required children, usually from ages 8 through 14, to attend school a certain specified number of days per year. Progress, sporadic and uneven across the nation and dependent upon the interest of the particular state, was so great that by 1914 the United States Commissioner of Education was prompted to call the small high school "one of the monuments to the American belief in education, beautiful, if often blind."

Local communities, prodded into action and aided financially by the state, built an educational system. A variety of attempts to extend federal aid to general education went down to defeat and no national policy therefore prevailed. Only later, in 1917, did Congress give funds for secondary education and this to the special areas of agriculture, home economics and the industrial arts in the form of the Smith-Hughes Act.²

In 1867, however, the United States established the Department of Education (later demoted to an Office) headed by a Commissioner who made available information about our own and foreign schools. If the titular leader of education for the nation only gathered statistics and advised, the role of each state's chief education officer was strengthened by law. By the end of the period, he examined teachers for certification, offered suggestions for the curriculum, and helped to determine standards for new buildings.

The South lagged. Not until the very end of the century did the Southern states begin to move in the direction in which the rest of the nation had already made great strides. The Reconstruction period held high hopes. The federally supported Freedman's Bureau

² See discussion below, pp. 22f.

built and operated schools; the reconstructed Southern states all accepted the *principle* of public support in their new constitutions; the Peabody and Slater funds encouraged teacher education and public aid. But the burden of a dual system for Negroes and whites, a distinctive pattern by 1890 and endorsed by the *Plessey v. Ferguson* decision, only exaggerated a problem of traditional public indifference.

An educational revival after 1900, spearheaded by enlightened Southern leadership and supported by philanthropic funds, stimulated public support. Nonetheless, although the *rate* of progress in the area was greater than in any other section of the nation from 1900 to 1914, the South, still predominantly rural and relatively poor, fared badly.

Far more remarkable than accumulated statistics was the altered spirit prevailing at all points in American education by 1914. In adjusting to the industrial and scientific, the social and intellectual revolution within the nation, the schools themselves were revolutionized. Beginning in the colleges in the late 1880's and increasing in tempo and scope throughout education after 1890, thoughtful and imaginative probings into the nature of the individual and the nature of society raised provocative questions about the objectives of formal education in the United States.

The public schools could not long ignore the problems attendant upon the rapid urbanization and industrialization which so sorely tried the old ties of home and community. A new role was forced upon them. More of a social necessity than ever before, the schools filled a vacuum created by the inability or slowness of other institutions to ease the shock of adjustment to a new life. The school, for example, was once again the chief agency for Americanizing a far more heterogeneous population than we had ever had. Where but in the schools, it was argued, could the immigrant's child learn not only the language needed for basic studies, but also citizenship within a democracy, good health habits, and the skills needed to succeed in a machine age? In the country, rural spokesmen, aware of urban problems out of a concern for the abandonment of the farm for the city, viewed the school as the only possible agency to incul-

cate agrarian values, improve farming and, hopefully, to stop the drift to town.

Whole new bodies of scientific and technological knowledge promised even greater progress and where but in the schools and colleges could this be best disseminated? Was it not appropriate for the schools to make the transition easier for the vast majority of students who went directly into industry, commerce or agriculture? The schools belonged to the people, it was contended, and they should therefore be responsive to public demand.

From urban and rural critics came the cry that the schools and colleges were aristocratic, undemocratic and patterned on worn-out medieval models. In answer, the elementary school, the high school and the college added frankly vocational courses. Advocates of curriculum change found their arguments buttressed by the work of psychology. Conventional conceptions of the importance of mental discipline and transfer of training, to which defenders of tradition looked for support, were undermined by empirical evidence of the functionalists and connectionists who offered alternative theories on how we learn. By the end of the era, research into individual differences in human intelligence and aptitude raised a further question on the appropriateness of a required course of subjects, each with intrinsic value.

Finally, romantic theories of the child, imported from Europe, found adherents for a child-centered school which would revolve around the needs and interests of active, growing children. Late in the century, these, too, were reinforced by empirical research. A host of evidence provided by the child-study movement, led by G. Stanley Hall, implied that adults would do well to heed, and not interfere with, the natural development of children. All served to provide new bases for evaluating formal education.

Rise of State Universities

The most perceptible changes came first in higher education, both private and public. The rise of the state universities—neither wholly state supported nor truly universities before 1865—served to democratize the college by offering practical education. Federal aid given in the Morrill Acts of 1862

and 1890 encouraged state subsidies which, in turn, encouraged a broadening of the curriculum and constituency already under way. Several states—Iowa, Kansas, Washington and Oregon—divided the land grant money among several colleges; in 20 states, separate colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts competed with the university for legislative funds.

Wisconsin, on the other hand, appended an agricultural college on to a struggling and narrowly conceived institution. After a slow start, the combination of federal and state money eventually produced a variety of utilitarian departments, expansion of the liberal arts, and a graduate college of merit. Here, the motto: "The boundaries of the campus are the boundaries of the state," dramatized a growing devotion of service; by 1914, visitors from all over the world admired the university's extension facilities for making information directly available to all citizens.³

New York created a new institution at Ithaca. Under the enlightened leadership of Andrew Dickson White, its first president, and Ezra Cornell, its generous benefactor, quasi-public Cornell University opened its doors in 1865 as a non-sectarian, comprehensive institution where intellectual life, service to the state and vocationalism were to live happily side by side. Cornell's words: "I would found an institution where any person can find instruction in any study," which White endorsed as "the true conception of a university," expressed the spirit of a new kind of higher education.⁴

As profoundly important was the emergence of the university from the pre-Civil War college. To compare the college of 1865 with the college or university of 1914 is to contrast two quite dissimilar institutions. Patterned on the German model, but reshaped by American requirements, the university grew out of the college, offering advanced degrees through the seminar, the lecture and laboratory research. By 1914,

46 institutions in the United States conferred Ph.D. degrees. The stream of American students seeking graduate education in Germany was channeled into our own institutions with the establishment of Johns Hopkins in 1876, Clark in 1888, the University of Chicago in 1892, and respectable graduate colleges at Harvard, Columbia, Princeton, Yale and several state universities.⁵

Sectarianism receded as science, long excluded from a place of prominence in the college curriculum, came to the fore. In scientific circles, battles over the validity of evolutionary theory were quickly won in Darwin's favor. Avowed Darwinians no longer shocked the academic world but instead became college presidents. Professional educators, many of them scientists, replaced ministers even as heads of institutions: Daniel Coit Gilman at Johns Hopkins, David Starr Jordan at Leland Stanford, Charles W. Eliot at Harvard, Andrew Dickson White at Cornell.

An awesome proliferation of knowledge produced whole new fields of study. History as a discipline, sociology, anthropology, political science, economics and even education were added to the increasing number of compartments into which the sciences were subdivided. Trained specialists, identified with a particular discipline through membership in learned societies, replaced the cleric teaching a half-dozen subjects. An almost incredible amount of new knowledge, the pervasive influence of the German example, and the relaxed hold of sectarianism led to a growing recognition of the right of the academic researcher to pursue truth wherever it might lead.⁶

Defenders of the classics protested in vain as their positions were preempted by newcomers to the scene. The elective system, so vigorously pushed by Eliot at Harvard from his inauguration in 1869 on and adopted in part by most colleges by 1900, further threatened to destroy dependence upon a single or limited curriculum for all. It was still possible, in 1914, to arouse a heated argument in academic circles on the merits of election of studies versus prescribe subjects, but the sciences, the modern languages, the social sciences and vocational courses were in the curriculum and were spreading.

³ Merle Curti and Vernon Carstensen, *The University of Wisconsin, A History, 1848-1925*, 2 vols., Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949, especially 1: 107-111.

⁴ Andrew Dickson White, *Autobiography*, 2 vols., New York: The Century Company, 1905, 1: 300.

⁵ John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition, An American History: 1636-1956*, New York, Harpers and Brothers, 1958, pp. 171-195.

⁶ The meaning and importance to America of the German *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit* is explored by Richard Hofstadter and Walter F. Metzger, *Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1955, pp. 386-393.

Professional schools of law, dentistry and medicine increased in number and, after 1910, in quality as well. At any major institution in the United States at the end of the era, one could earn an undergraduate and often a graduate degree, not only in the time-honored liberal arts, but in such vocational studies as: agriculture; architecture; forestry; chemical, civil, mechanical or sanitary engineering; commerce; education; domestic science; journalism; and music.⁷ Women joined the throngs attending college to partake of the new learning. By the end of the century, in state institutions as well as private colleges throughout the nation, women vindicated early proponents of co-education. Democracy had invaded the ivory tower.

High School-College Relationship

With the expansion of the college and growth of the high school, there was disturbing confusion over the role of each. How could a unified system be hammered out of the disparate parts? Who was to decide the appointed task of the public high school? For a time, it appeared that the college would make the decision. Each college had always had its entrance examinations and between 1870 and 1900, high schools met new requirements of modern history and languages, geography and the sciences. When the individual efforts of individual institutions proved inadequate, regional organizations sought to bring order out of chaos. The New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, formed in 1885, was followed by a similar organization in the middle Atlantic states in 1892 and in the Midwest in 1894. Outside the East, where the state gave substantial support to a university or college system, statewide plans were adopted. Michigan's solution, widely adopted by 1900, was sending university staff members to inspect high schools of the state thus permitting students from approved

schools to proceed automatically to the university.

The lack of coordination pleased no one. Despite attempts to define the task of the high school, colleges found it necessary to offer the equivalent of a secondary education. As late as 1890, for instance, almost as many students were enrolled in college preparatory departments as in collegiate departments in our institutions of higher learning.⁸ The colleges were unhappy with their dual role and the high schools complained of dominance by college authorities who appeared to be unaware of the monumental task involved in educating everyone. The questions remained: How could the high schools best serve the needs of most students? Was the task of the high school to prepare students for college or to give them an adequate terminal education?

Two committees of the National Education Association, one in 1893 and the other in 1918, dramatized the radical change in the avowed purpose of secondary education. The 1893 Committee of Ten, headed by Harvard's President Eliot, declared the "main function" of the high school that of preparing students, not for college, but "for the duties of life." What did this mean? To this Committee, which adhered to the theories of mental discipline already under fire, it meant that the school should offer a hard core of subjects, all of equal value, "to be taught consecutively and thoroughly" for the purpose of "training the powers of observation, memory, expression and reasoning. . . ."⁹ The job of the high school, the Committee suggested, was to cultivate the intellectual abilities of all students, regardless of their background, aspirations, or abilities.

By 1918, when the N.E.A.'s Committee on Reorganization of the Secondary Schools issued its famous seven cardinal principles, the whole purpose of secondary education was redefined. Only one of the principles—command of the fundamental processes—was clearly designed for intellectual development. The others: citizenship, worthy home membership, vocational efficiency, worthy use of leisure time, ethical character and health offered far broader goals to guide the high school. While not abandoning its ini-

⁷ This list, deemed representative, is in the *Report of the United States Commissioner of Education*, 1914, 2: 208-219.

⁸ Newcomer, *A Century of Higher Education for Women*, p. 22; Harvard's president noted five-sixths of the colleges in the United States maintaining preparatory departments in 1890, Charles William Eliot, *Educational Reform, Essays and Addresses*, New York: The Century Company, 1898, p. 198.

⁹ *Report of the Committee on Secondary Studies of the National Education Association, 1893*, United States Bureau of Education, #205, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895, pp. 51-52.

tial aim, the public high school expanded its function in American society.

The new official ideology was only a recognition of already established fact. In the high school, an explosion of the curriculum within the comprehensive high school had produced a revolution fully as profound as that in higher education. By 1914, it was possible to earn high school credit for subjects ranging from "Roman customs and institutions to tinsmithing," from the traditional Greek and Latin to band and orchestra.¹⁰ Early clashes among labor, management and educators over manual training led, in several of the larger cities, to the establishment of distinctly technical schools. But vocationally-oriented separate schools were in the minority. Firm in its commitment to universal education, the United States was reluctant to divide students into laboring and non-laboring classes. More characteristically American was the all-inclusive high school where students could elect from a widening range of curricula, each of which led to a diploma. Diversity within uniformity therefore prevailed.

Utilitarian courses in machine shop, carpentry, electricity as well as specialized subjects in agriculture and home economics were added to already existing institutions. Commercial courses, long offered at the secondary level, expanded their domain. Even the traditional academic offerings appeared in new garb. The ancient languages and history lost priority to modern languages and American history; civics replaced political economy and civil government; above all, the sciences flourished. According to one detailed study of the period, the only subject universally required of all high school students in 1910 was English composition into which the former grammar and rhetoric had been incorporated.¹¹

In elementary education, widely available to all youth, fresh, exciting experiments were rare before 1900. The three R's dominated by the formal recitation and routine memori-

zation formed the substance of the curriculum. Attempts to translate theories of various European educators for America met with varying successes. In the 1870's the "Object Method" of Edward P. Sheldon at Oswego, New York, Normal School, launched a wave of Pestalozzianism in the United States. Admittedly, much of the spontaneity so fundamental to the great Swiss educator was lost in the transplantation; nonetheless, Sheldon's experiment did call attention to the needs of active children and demonstrated the value of teaching via readily observable examples rather than the remote, abstract knowledge so attractive to adults.¹²

The kindergarten, based on Friedrich Froebel's mystical view of the importance of play in human development, became a part of the St. Louis, Missouri, school system in 1873; by 1898, 189 cities supported public kindergartens in which teachers supervised the games and socialization of active children. Finally, Herbartian psychology, brought from Germany in the 1880's, exalted the role of the teacher in forming character and stressed the importance of literature and history. While these were all regarded by skeptics as merely passing fads, they made an important break with tradition and opened the way for wide experimentation and an altered view of the child in the classroom.

"Progressive" Education

By World War I, a host of "progressives" in education exalted a new approach to the child and a new conception of the role of the school in American society. Contemporary with, and a part of, the larger political and social progressive movement, devoted reformers entertained a vision of a new society in which the schools would play a crucial role.¹³ The best known spokesman for "progressive education" was, of course, John Dewey. From 1896 to 1904, at the Chicago experimental school, Dewey sought closer correlations between traditionally separated theory and practice, the child and his curriculum, and the society and the school of which it was a part. Deeply committed to the democratic ideal, Dewey regarded the school as a legitimate laboratory through which each potential citizen would be encouraged to use his intelligence for the bet-

¹⁰ *Report of the United States Commissioner of Education*, 1914, 1: 127.

¹¹ John Elbert Stout, *The Development of High School Curricula in the North Central States from 1860 to 1918*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921, especially pages 147-223.

¹² Ned Harlan Dearborn, *The Oswego Movement in American Education*, New York: Columbia Teachers College, 1925.

¹³ Lawrence A. Cremin, "The Progressive Movement in American Education: A Perspective," *Harvard Educational Review*, v. 27, #4, Fall, 1957, pp. 251-270.

terment of society. The purpose of knowledge, he said, was "to make one experience freely available in other experiences."¹⁴ If this were so, insisting that the child learn things without consideration of his previous experiences was a lost cause.

Seeking connections between arbitrarily separated bodies of knowledge and the children who studied them, Dewey offered a new approach both to pedagogy and to the function of education. If his statement that "there is nothing to which education is subordinate save more education" was adopted as a mere slogan by later disciples, it did express a contemporary and widespread American faith in the efficacy of education. It also endorsed the work of reformers who, often without a knowledge of Dewey's optimistic pragmatism, were hard at work creating schools quite unlike any the United States had previously known.

Dewey was neither the earliest of critics offering suggestions to teachers nor was he the most antagonistic to the existing educational order. As early as the 1870's, Francis W. Parker (referred to by Dewey as the father of progressive education) made world-renowned the Quincy, Massachusetts, public schools. Here, children startled visitors by actually learning more through an activity-oriented school than through traditional formal methods. At the turn of the century in the Laboratory School attached to Cook County Normal in Illinois (eventually absorbed into the University of Chicago), Parker and his devoted staff broke down barriers between subjects, eased relationships between students and teachers and linked the school to life outside. Children learned reading, composition and arithmetic through nature hikes, the study of local geography, creative art and music. The romantic Parker dramatically insisted "There never was such a thing as a lazy child. . . ."¹⁵

In the heart of an industrial center, Gary, Indiana, a flexible curriculum revolved

around community and child needs. Here, public school children conducted mock elections to learn civics and applied the lessons of cooking and accounting in a student-operated lunch room.¹⁶ In La Porte and Indianapolis, Indiana, and in Minneapolis, Minnesota, enlightened teachers who integrated studies for active children found rich rewards in heightened interest and greater learning.¹⁷

The movement to redirect the school was no mere urban phenomenon. From Cornell University in the late 1890's, horticulturalist Liberty Hyde Bailey issued a plea to infuse meaning into rural education through the study of nature. "I want to see our country schools," Bailey wrote, "without screwed-down seats and to see children put to work with tools and soils and plants and problems."¹⁸ In Iowa, agricultural journalist Henry Wallace protested education for an élite and, in delightfully earthy phrases, chided teachers for continuing the stultifying forced learning in rural schools.

In 1902, in Illinois and Ohio, O. J. Kern and A. B. Graham, both rural school supervisors, simultaneously organized agricultural clubs to combat student and parental lethargy toward education. Youngsters tested soil samples and seed corn, peered through microscopes and, by applying science to agriculture, amazed their parents with increased corn yields, productive poultry flocks, and amazing sugar-beet crops. Out of the rural school came the nucleus organization from which the national 4-H club movement grew. Everywhere, it seemed, on the farm and in the city, the potential of the school for individual and social change was being recognized.

The period under survey was one of optimism and self-confidence. In the Gilded Age of the post-Civil War decades, the schools extended opportunity for education to a wide proportion of the population. In a society where the intellectual élite and ruling classes were by no means synonymous, the schools developed a multiplicity of tracks within a single educational system universally available to all. By the end of the century, the reform spirit touched all aspects of American life leaving a particular imprint upon the schools whose very function, at all levels, had been redefined.

¹⁴ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916, p. 395.

¹⁵ Francis W. Parker, *Talks on Pedagogics*, New York: John Day Company, 1937, pp. 16, 340.

¹⁶ John and Evelyn Dewey, *Schools of Tomorrow*, New York: E. P. Dutton, 1915, pp. 175-204.

¹⁷ Joseph Mayer Rice, *The Public-School System of the United States*, New York: The Century Company, 1893, p. 193.

¹⁸ Liberty Hyde Bailey, *The State and the Farmer*, New York: Macmillan, 1908, pp. 189-190.

Under the pressure of World War II, "the federal government expanded its educational activities . . . and made way for the more widespread participation . . . which was to follow in the post-war years."

Public Education in the United States, 1918-1945

BY HARRY V. BARNARD AND JOHN HARDIN BEST

Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University

TIMES OF CRISIS in the United States during the years from 1918 to 1945 appear to have led to gradual federal involvement in American education. The period of stress of the First World War produced national legislation directed toward aiding several specific programs in secondary education, programs which were expanded, within limited scope, during the relatively placid period of the 1920's. The national emergency created by the Great Depression brought about massive efforts to restore economic equilibrium through legislative action on the part of the federal government. This legislation affected virtually every level of public education.

The depression decade resolved itself into the international crisis of the Second World War, and once again the pressures of the times resulted in further federal involvement with far-reaching implications in American education. To understand the growing in-

fluence of the national government in public education over these years from 1918 to 1945, let us view the general state of education and the ensuing legislation within each of these three periods.

The fervent spirit of nationalism and patriotism of the First World War produced governmental action in many areas, in war mobilization and production of armaments, all aimed toward bringing the great strength of America to bear on the war. The ultimate aims of the United States were the ideals of Wilson stated in the Fourteen Points and his efforts to see a just and lasting peace created in the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. These wartime efforts were followed in the decade of the 1920's by a concentration on domestic affairs and a comfortable materialism, summarized in the phrase, "return to normalcy." The peace and prosperity of the era of the 1920's became a reality for most Americans in the form of a business boom. Admittedly, farmers and some other groups found themselves not so prosperous as once they were, and in fact rural America generally was not a party to the prosperity of the times. Still, President Coolidge aptly stated the prevailing temper of the decade with the phrase "The business of America is business."

These years of the war and the post-war brought important developments in several directions in American education. The fact that in the decade of the 1920's there was no overwhelming crisis, international or domestic (until the closing months of the decade), had, in a negative sense, considerable effect on education. Uncommitted to

Harry V. Barnard and John Hardin Best are both Assistant Professors of Education at the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. Dr. Barnard earned his doctorate at the University of Alabama and served as Clerk of the Subcommittee on Special Education of the U.S. House of Representatives before coming to Rutgers. Dr. Best received his baccalaureate at Duke and his master's and doctor's degrees at the University of North Carolina, where he taught prior to coming to Rutgers.

any overriding national purpose, American education was free to develop experimentally and theoretically in new directions.

The influence of the philosophy of pragmatism began to be felt in many areas of educational theory. The thought of William James and John Dewey seemed to provide means for organizing and bringing about constructive change in an area such as education. Efforts to approach the study of education analytically and scientifically, moreover, produced striking results, as in a project such as the Hartshorne and May *Character Education Inquiry*.¹ The project attempted, with considerable success, to analyze the nature of character and to understand by what means it could be successfully taught. New approaches in psychological theories of learning, the behaviorist and the *gestaltist*, pointed to new developments in method and practices in teaching and learning. Educational theory in the 1920's, in general, was a fertile field of new ideas and efforts.

Goals of Secondary Education

A commission of the National Education Association in 1918 stated a set of aims for education, the *Seven Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, which summed up in concise form the directions of the new emphases in education. These aims, which found broad support in the 1920's from America's educational leadership, were the following: command of fundamental processes; health; worthy home membership; vocational efficiency; civic participation; worthy use of leisure time; and ethical character. Above all, the implication of the *Seven Cardinal Principles* was that the American high school should accept responsibility for the education of all American youth and no longer just that group who would continue from high school to college.

Developments in practice in American schools during the 1920's reflected in some aspects the research and the stated aims of education for the period. The junior high school movement which originated in the decade was influenced in large part by the

effort to free children for a longer period of time from the pressures of college preparation, to allow the student more time for exploratory studies, as well as to permit a smoother transition for the individual from elementary to secondary school.

Practices in general in American schools, however, exhibited little striking change or development. Progressive methods and techniques in education were much discussed but rarely implemented. Shift of orientation in secondary schools toward the ideals stated in the *Seven Cardinal Principles* was slow and faltering. Methods and practices in the schools of the United States remained to a wide degree "traditional," much as they had been at the beginning of the century.

Enrollments continued to rise in the decade of the 1920's, in part a result of the wartime birth boom, but mainly because more young people were continuing in schools for a longer time. And with the rising enrollments and general economic prosperity of the period, school construction boomed, with junior high schools as well as elementary and secondary buildings—most of it in the grade school gothic style still evident today in any American town.

Expansion of school construction and rising enrollments though strong in the cities were not so evident in rural America. The prosperity of the 1920's had never quite touched the farmer, and one evidence of his plight was in the generally limited educational facilities in rural communities; throughout the nation the one-room schoolhouse still remained in many of these areas. Some efforts were made to expand and improve the program of the rural school, efforts which usually grew out of the magnified agricultural interests of the First World War. In general, however, education in rural America was left out of the expansion of the 1920's.

Federal Activity

The major portion of federal educational activity during this era as would be expected was in the field of agricultural and vocational education. Though the federal government had since 1862 supported agricultural and industrial education at the college level, the Federal Vocational Education Act of 1917, commonly referred to as the Smith-

¹ Hugh Hartshorne and Mark A. May, *et al*, *Studies in the Nature of Character*, 3 volumes, I: *Studies in Deceit*; II: *Studies in Service and Self-Control*; III: *Studies in the Organization of Character*. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928-1930).

Hughes Act, was the first effort to extend aid to schools below the college level. The Act was to train students 14 years of age or older by

... cooperating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers, supervisors and directors of agricultural subjects, and teachers of trade, home economics and industrial subjects and in the preparation of teachers . . .²

From the very beginning it was emphasized that the Smith-Hughes Act was designed to meet *local* needs and that the programs instituted under the Act were to be controlled by local educational authorities. The federal government assisted the local communities in studying their problems and in developing effective and up-to-date courses, yet made no attempt to dictate to them.

In 1918, after only one year of operation, the appropriations for this program were increased by \$700,000 to a total of \$2.4 million. Appropriations continued to increase and by the academic year 1932-1933 almost \$10 million was being appropriated annually.

With the increased appropriations, which had to be matched dollar-for-dollar by the states, the schools were making great strides toward providing vocational training for that 85 per cent of the youngsters who had previously left high school with no saleable skills. The new program, as one member of Congress predicted, was helping to "... make it possible for every boy and girl to go out into the world equipped for the practical training for life's work."

In addition to aiding vocational and agricultural education directly, the appropriations under the Smith-Hughes Act, and subsequent vocational educational legislation, aided indirectly *all* of education. With the direct assistance provided by the federal government for the development of vocational education programs, the states and localities could then devote more of their own money and efforts to other educational endeavors. So successful was the federal aid to vocational education programs that it was extended and expanded in 1929 by the George-

Reed Act and in 1936 by the George-Ellzey Act.

With the exception of aid to vocational education and the limited educational opportunities provided for disabled veterans of World War I under the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1918, the federal government maintained a general policy of *laissez faire* during the 1920's.

Time of Despair

The economic chaos attending the stock market "crash" of 1929 and the Great Depression, which continued through the decade of the 1930's, shattered the complacency of peace and prosperity which had characterized America since the First World War. This time of despair, of disillusion was described by John W. Studebaker, the United States Commissioner of Education in 1935, in these remarks:

On every hand it is said that we have become the slaves of the machines we have built. Our capacity to produce the material basis for an abundant life has far exceeded our ability to control and direct the huge powers of a machine age. We are indeed living today in a most paradoxical world.

People are idle, we are told, because they produce too much. They are feverishly preparing for more ghastly wars, and yet they hate and fear war. They are not well fed, and yet they destroy food. They are poorly clothed, and yet they plow under cotton and run their marvelous textile mills at less than half their capacity. They lack proper educational facilities for their children because of vast curtailments of opportunity and no proper expansion, and yet they have thousands of trained teachers ready and eager to educate.³

Franklin Roosevelt coming to the presidency in 1933 as the champion of the "forgotten man," brought the bold political action of the New Deal to many areas of the nation's economy, toward alleviating the effects of the collapse and solving the most crucial social problems of the time. Above all the sweeping actions of the New Deal encouraged a return of confidence and a hope on the part of masses that "Recovery" was indeed possible. Roosevelt in his first inaugural address set this attitude in his words, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

² *The Congressional Record*, January 9, 1917.

³ John W. Studebaker, "Liberalism and Adult Civic Education," *School and Society*, XLII. (October 12, 1935) p. 489.

Theory in education during the Depression decade was vitally concerned with the social role of the school in the midst of the economic crisis in American society. John Dewey, writing at the time, stated a view representative of the thinking of many educators:

I think the depression has had one healthy effect. It has led to a more general questioning of the primacy of material values. Events have disclosed the demoralizing effect of making success in business the chief aim in life. But I think that still greater economic reconstruction must take place before material attainment and the acquisitive motive will be reduced to their place. It is difficult to produce a co-operative type of character in an economic system that lays chief stress upon competition, and where the most successful competitor is the one who is most richly rewarded and who becomes almost the social hero and model.

As long as society does not guarantee security of useful work, security for old age, and security of a decent home and of opportunity for education of all children by other means than acquisition of money, that long the very affection of parents for their children, their desire that children may have a better opportunity than their parents had, will compel parents to put great emphasis upon getting ahead in material ways, and their example will be a dominant factor in educating children.⁴

A statement of aims of education, entitled *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy*, was formulated in 1938 by the N.E.A.'s Educational Policies Commission. In general this statement was a reaffirmation of the Seven Cardinal Principles of two decades earlier with, however, a perceptible shift of emphasis toward the responsibilities of education to society.

The statement in the *Purposes* clearly enunciated the principle that the school must meet an obligation to *all* youth. Technological and industrial development in America by the decade of the 1930's had placed a burden greater than ever before on the school to give training and background to equip workers to meet the demands of this increasingly industrial society. It seemed clear that in expanding the program in tech-

nical education the schools could not only help the individual in equipping him for the demands of society, but could contribute directly toward lessening the economic crisis of the Depression.

The aims of education were clearly stated, yet the reality of these aims fell far short. School construction rather than keeping pace with the rise in enrollments was generally curtailed under the economic stress of the times. Many communities shortened the school term, and many others in fact closed schools entirely. Programs and curricula which might have benefited that segment of the school population who would not continue into college were dropped or cut back or were never begun, again because of lack of financial support.

In surveying the state of education at the secondary level in 1934, E. W. Butterfield, then Commissioner of Education in Connecticut, pointed out the change in social and economic makeup of at least half of the high school population, a group which had not been present in the secondary schools of 1900. This group he termed "The New Fifty Per Cent."⁵ In an essay, much discussed and quoted at the time, Butterfield pointed out the needs of this new group, which differed considerably from the former college preparatory makeup of the high school. From this writing and from efforts by many other educators came the beginning of programs and curricula adjusted to the demands of all youth in secondary schools.

Aid For Youth

Yet the schools of the 1930's were still making only a beginning toward fitting American education for all youth. It appeared that American schools were so far from achieving this goal, in fact were so far out of touch with the masses of young Americans during the early depression years, that federal funds toward educating and benefiting these youth could perhaps not rightfully go to American schools. Rather, those young people who most needed the emergency aid during the depression years were not to be found in schools. Hence, the federal efforts to return young men and women to schools. Hence, the federal programs creating whole organizations outside the

⁴ John Dewey, "Character Training for Youth," *Recreation*, XXIX. (June, 1935) p. 142.

⁵ E. W. Butterfield, "The New Fifty Per Cent," *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, VIII. (January, 1934) pp. 265-272.

bounds of public education yet paralleling many of its functions. Hence, the N.Y.A., the C.C.C. and adult education programs of many types and varieties.

Before the end of F.D.R.'s famous "first one hundred days" the Congress had enacted legislation providing for the establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps. The Corps provided employment, sustenance, clothing, and what was planned to be a wholesome environment for jobless young men between the ages of 18 and 25 who enrolled voluntarily for six month terms. Enlistees came rapidly and, at the heights of the Corps' development, filled over 2,600 residence camps. The maximum enrollment of 300,000 was maintained at full strength most of the time by re-enlistments and new enrollees.

The initial purposes of providing remunerative employment to destitute young men and of conserving natural resources in national parks and national forests were extended soon after the establishment of the C.C.C. As pointed out by President Roosevelt, the Corps should also "further the training" of the enlistees. Both formal and informal educational programs were developed; during the almost ten years of the Corps existence, approximately 90 per cent of the more than three million enrollees took part in some type of education activity. In addition to the hundreds of thousands who received vocational training, over 100,000 were taught to read and write, over 25,000 were graduated from the eighth grade and over 5,000 from high school. A total of almost \$3 billion was spent on the C.C.C. between 1933 and 1941.⁶

Another anti-depression measure providing aid to education was the National Youth Administration, which was organized under the Works Progress Administration in 1935. Under the N.Y.A., jobless youth of good character and academic ability could earn up to \$15 per week doing clerical, custodial, or scholarly work while enrolled in schools. A total of over one million high school and college students received aid from the N.Y.A. and its predecessor, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. The N.Y.A., like the C.C.C., was abandoned during the early months of the Second World War.

During the depression years, the federal government also aided education through the Public Works Administration by providing loans for the construction of school buildings. It also extended aid to teachers, musicians, writers, artists, and other scholarly workers through programs such as the Federal Writers' Project and the maintenance of W.P.A. Orchestras. The W.P.A. provided a truly wide panorama of educational activities for children and adults, enrolling in a peak month as many as 1.5 million persons in adult education and almost 50,000 in nursery schools.

Federal action in education was aimed primarily not toward supporting the public education system in its aim of educating all American youth, but more urgently, the federal funds went directly into programs which would relieve some of the immediate economic stress of the depression. The legislation passed by Congress in the area of education, and in these quasi-educational efforts, was clearly forced by the economic crisis of the times. The aim of economic recovery was foremost in this action.

During the years of the Second World War the American educational scene changed relatively little from that which had existed in the 1930's. The international crisis of the war replaced the domestic crisis of the depression years. The N.E.A.'s Educational Policies Commission took up the question of aims of education once again, and in 1944 issued a statement, *Education for All American Youth*, which was essentially a reformulation of the basic aims stated in the decades preceding. The stress of the depression on American education was exchanged for the pressures of the war, shortage of teachers, lack of materials for school construction and generally resulting limitations on school programs. Again, as in the past, the federal government moved to meet the immediate crisis in education brought by the times.

The Lanham Act

In the fall of 1941, just prior to the entry of the United States into the Second World War, the Congress passed the Lanham Act which provided aid for the construction, maintenance and operation of schools in districts which were suddenly overcrowded as a

⁶ Hollis, P. Allen, *The Federal Government and Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950, p. 94.

result of government war projects. Local communities were usually expected to match in part the funds provided by the Lanham Act; however, if the local communities could not contribute toward the construction of the buildings, the Federal Works Administration often built the buildings and leased them to the local governments.

In addition to the Lanham Act, the Community Facilities Services, authorized by the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, provided loans to state and local governments for the planning of educational facilities. The Lanham Act, moreover, was extended and expanded by the passage of Public Laws 815 and 874 during the late years of the war period.

Other programs involving various educational activities were initiated by the federal government during the war "in the interest of national security." These programs provided nurseries and special schools for the children of defense workers, below college level vocational training for defense workers, and engineering and management training in colleges and universities. Around 12 million workers were trained under these programs between 1940 and 1945. The Student War Loan Program was established in the United States Office of Education to provide funds for students in technical and pro-

fessional areas essential to the war-time effort.

On June 22, 1944, the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346). This Act, combined with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1943 (Public Law 16), authorized programs of unprecedented scope. Public Law 16 provided for the re-training or re-education of those whose vocational competencies had been destroyed by service connected disabilities, and Public Law 346 (popularly known as the "G.I. Bill") provided honorably discharged veterans with educational or vocational training for a period of one year plus the number of months served in the armed forces. The cost of the veteran's tuition, books, supplies and equipment were paid directly to the institution which he attended. Over 8 million veterans received benefits under this "G.I. Bill of Rights," at a total cost of approximately \$15 billion.

In addition to the more striking examples of direct federal aid given under programs such as the Lanham Act and the "G.I. Bill," the federal government expanded its educational activities into many other areas and made way for the more widespread participation of the national government in American education which was to follow in the post-war years.

"... The Continental Congress . . . , set up under the Articles of Confederation, had no sovereignty of any kind; that is, it was unable to make final decisions in any field and enforce them. It could not raise an army nor pay them. It was dependent entirely upon donations from the sovereign individual colonies and was entirely dependent upon them for its soldiers.

"... At the end of the Revolutionary War, the Articles of Confederation proved to be completely inadequate for the administration of the country. They could not prevent the setting up of tariff barriers between the individual colonies; they could not enforce the peace treaty that was signed with Great Britain; and there was every indication that the colonies would drop apart into individual states or group of states. . . .

"The federal concept of a union government was the invention of the founding fathers of this country, and it has been adopted by many other countries since. Under this system as we know, the states and the people reserved certain rights to themselves and designated only a limited number of them to the federal government. In this way local interests were properly protected and the national interest was given a strong position. . . ."—*Harold C. Urey, Professor of Chemistry at Large, California University in an address in New York City, April 11, 1961.*

"Whether a college is publicly supported or privately supported, ultimately its support comes from the people," notes this specialist, who believes that "The important point is that the American public has become genuinely interested in education. . . . This kind of interest and action is highly desirable."

Higher Education Today

By GERALD P. BURNS

Executive Director, Independent College Funds of America

TREMENDOUS CHANGES are occurring today in higher education. Some of these changes are visible and some obscure. All, however, are brought about either by threats or challenges. Those considered *threats* are negative and can be grouped under at least four major headings—financial hazards, government influence, personnel shortages and enrollment problems. Those considered *challenges* are positive and also can be listed under at least four headings—competition with other institutions, public interpretation, curriculum revision, and extra-curricular possibilities.

Perhaps it is a good thing that the Russians put a moon in orbit before we did. Certainly it caused a much-needed awakening to the fact that we, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, were not doing all we might in the related fields of science and education. All at once attention was focused on the technological achievements of the U.S.S.R., which many had considered a sleeping giant or a nation of wild-eyed revolutionaries. It was plain that these technological achievements came about through extensive education and rigorous training—perhaps more and better than we were providing in the United States.

When the beep of the first moon and the contrail of the early rockets began to dim, so too did the interest of the great majority of Americans in scientific and educational status in the world. However, many thoughtful leaders realized that even though the first blush of concern had faded, the point had been scored: we should take a hard look at our schools and colleges. As this hard look was taken, it became apparent that the

Russians were not so far ahead of us, that they were leading in specific areas only, and that from the broad view of incorporating humanistic education along with scientific training, our educational system was far the best for the attainment of our national goals.

As the observations were made, as data were gathered, as conclusions were drawn, it also became apparent that, although our schools and colleges were doing a creditable job, they were far from perfect. Some justifiable criticism (and much unjustifiable criticism) was levelled at our educators, especially those in higher education. The main burden of the constructive criticism was that we were not making changes fast enough to keep up with the shrinking globe, the jet age or the era of the atom. In the effort to make the appropriate changes, to correct our deficiencies, to enhance our strong points, it became obvious that the above-mentioned threats and challenges provided the stimulus we needed and the guidelines we desired to get on with the job most effectively.

Threats to Higher Education

Financial hazards constitute the greatest threat facing the colleges and universities of the nation. It is doubtful if any institution

Gerald P. Burns is a special lecturer in educational administration at Teachers College, Columbia University. He has been a Ford Foundation scholar, and also has taught at colleges and universities in the U.S. From 1955 to 1958 he was Vice-President of Reed College.

in the country has all the money it needs to do the job it wants to. The pinch has been caused by rising costs and the shrinking value of the dollar. Educational institutions have in the past operated in a deficit position—they have never charged what their services cost. Consequently, as enrollments increased, the deficits grew proportionately larger. And this financial pinch was felt by the public (tax supported) as well as the private (tuition and gift supported) institutions.

In 1957–1958, according to the United States Office of Education, the current income of all institutions of higher education totalled \$4.6 billion. Gifts in cash, services, and goods by individuals and non-government organizations totalled \$747,773,192, about \$4.31 for every man, woman and child in the United States. Private institutions received 81.8 per cent of all gifts and grants. Legislatures are continuing to appropriate increasing amounts for the public institutions and the private institutions continue to augment their income from tuition and gifts. But the gap between what is secured and what is needed continues to widen.

Government influence or control is thought by some to be a serious threat to the continuance of our dual system of public and private higher education. There are those who say the only way we can surmount the financial problems facing the colleges and universities is to turn to Washington for massive federal aid. Others say that if such a course is followed, “he who pays the piper calls the tune” and the government will exert a profound influence on our higher institutions.

It is the feeling of this writer that the independent institutions may be freer from influence than the tax-supported institutions, but that this is a relative situation varying in each institution. Certainly our great municipal colleges and outstanding state universities are not being subverted or dictated to by their Boards of Estimate or legislatures. Then too, the independent institutions are now receiving considerable support from the federal government in the form of loans for buildings and scholarships, and from both the government and the giant corporations for contract research, but there has been no attempt on the part of either unduly to in-

fluence the recipient institutions. In 1957–1958 the amount from the federal government exceeded \$700 million, of which 70 per cent went for research.

However, it is possible that if because of inadequate financing the private institutions were to disappear, a single system of higher education would develop whereby government control might follow government support. One sure way to combat any such situation is to keep the private colleges strong. Another way, assuming the private colleges were given considerable government support, would be to adopt a policy similar to that used by Britain in distributing funds from the Exchequer to the universities through a University Grants Committee.

Personnel shortages have long been a distinct threat to the colleges and universities. Until recently, the greatest shortage was found in several of the scholarly disciplines. Some shortages still exist for qualified faculty members because of an insufficient number being graduated in certain subject fields and because industry can attract away the key men by offering higher salaries. However, the graduate and professional schools are now turning out more people in the critical areas and faculty salaries (especially in the larger universities) are beginning to come closer to industrial salaries.

The greatest personnel shortage is in the administrative or executive side of higher education. Not only are there insufficient administrators available, but many of the people holding executive positions in colleges and universities are admittedly incompetent. A genuine effort is needed on the part of leaders in the corporations (as financial backers), in the foundations (as locators of talent), and in the universities (as training centers) to fill this need.

It is unfortunate that college trustees are pressured into hiring as college and university presidents persons who are unqualified in experience and unsuited in temperament to the demands of the presidency. It is ironical that these trustees unwittingly reach into the military for commanders and into the classrooms for professors who have had no experience in academic administration. These presidential candidates take on this specialized task reluctantly, struggle with it unsuccessfully for an average of eight years,

and leave it as bitter and frustrated individuals.]

Trustees themselves must be chosen carefully and oriented properly to their heavy responsibility, a major part of which is the selection of the chief executive officer. When they exercise this function and elect a president, it should be a man qualified for the job by education, experience and personality. The trustees have every right to expect some help from the foundations (in terms of recommendations) and from the universities (in terms of training and experience).

On the latter subject—providing specialized education and professional experience for future presidents and other administrators—the major universities have a heavy responsibility. Only in the past few years has there been a genuine and fairly widespread acceptance of the notion that college administration is as much a science as an art—that administrators are made as well as born.

Fortunately, the larger foundations (notably Ford and Carnegie) have taken steps to support programs designed to provide administrators for higher education. Several institutions (including New York University, Teachers College, Rutgers University, the University of Michigan, and the University of California) are offering specialized courses and seminars in this field. A few institutions (such as the University of Arkansas) offer training opportunities through "internships." A few publishers (notably Harper Brothers and McGraw-Hill) are turning out important books for the edification of future administrators. [All of these are steps in the right direction. As the pipeline fills and more qualified administrators are available, this acute shortage in administrative personnel will disappear.]¹⁰

Enrollment problems constitute the fourth major threat. There is no question that all existing colleges and universities are going to be hard pressed properly to educate the great numbers of young people who will be descending on them in the next few years. However, the tidal wave of students is still a time and distance from our shores. This threat can be met and the problem solved if existing institutions are expanded, new institutions built and several sacred cows sent

to the abattoir. The first and second solutions are obvious—the third needs further explanation.

Since the first colleges and universities opened in this nation, it has been a practice to have most classes in the morning, laboratory periods and a few classes in the afternoon, and no formal meetings of undergraduate academic groups in the evenings. In addition, Saturdays and Sundays have been set aside as days of worship and contemplation, rest and relaxation. In consequence of this, there is on nearly every campus considerable waste space. Sooner or later this inefficient handling of space and schedules must be corrected. Student and faculty resistance to afternoon, evening and weekend classes, laboratories and seminars must be overcome. Legislatures will not appropriate, nor donors contribute the amounts of money necessary to cope with the expected peaks of enrollment and general phenomenal growth under existing conditions.

It should be possible by careful scheduling to find a way to accommodate the increased numbers expected. If scientific scheduling is coupled with modest expansion of existing plants and some construction of new colleges and universities, this threat will be met and dissolved. With many more children actually in the high schools and a greater percentage of them wanting to go to college, no effort should be spared to accommodate these future leaders of America.

Challenges to Higher Education Today

Institutional competition is providing a real challenge to higher education today. This is in the nature of a desirable situation in that this kind of challenge places renewed emphasis on admissions officers seeking highly qualified students. The standards of all our colleges and universities are elevated when they are striving for excellence and quality—and certain aspects of competition promote this.

There are many kinds of institutions making up our dual systems of public and private higher education in America. The public institutions are tax supported, usually by the city or the state. The private institutions are tuition and gift supported and usually receive some income from endowment. Within

the public groups are the municipal colleges, community colleges, teachers colleges and state universities with their many professional schools and state-wide services. Within the private group are junior colleges, technical institutions, liberal arts colleges, and great universities—some with church relationships, some with no special connections. Each college and university in this nation is a little different from the other—and this is all for the best. The diversity in aims and outcomes gives a rich and varied flavor to the education and training of the persons graduating from these institutions.

Public interpretation of higher education has taken on new importance. Educators realize now more than ever that they and their institutions are not separate and apart from the community, but rather, are related to and provide services for this trend, this new emphasis on public relations.

Whether a college or university is publicly supported or privately supported, ultimately its support comes from the people. In the private institutions, it comes chiefly from tuition and gifts. To insure a continuance of support, it is necessary to interpret adequately the services of the institution to the public. Obviously, the general public is composed of several segments with different relationships to the institution. There are the legislators, trustees, alumni, donors, prospects and potential students. And, internally, there are the students and faculty. Because of these different publics, and the variety of media and techniques to contact them, the job of interpreting has become difficult and important, calling for skilled, professional workers. Then, too, since educational institutions are all interested in doing the best possible interpretive job, because many of the potential students and prospective donors are the same, some competition inevitably occurs.

The important point is that the American public has become genuinely interested in education. Action has been taken on the local, state and national levels to improve and expand our educational programs. This kind of interest and action is highly desirable. We hope this trend will continue, and we must answer honestly and accurately the questions the public is raising.

Curriculum revision is perhaps the most

important challenge facing higher education today. All fields of knowledge are burgeoning with such rapidity that all institutions must make special efforts to stay abreast. No college or university can rest on past performance. Advances in specialized fields such as electronics, atomic power and automation require that higher institutions accept primary responsibility for training young people for leadership.

In addition to the advances in scientific and technological subject matter, great strides have been made in the social and political sciences. Man's world is smaller now and he must soon learn to live in peace with other men if he is to live at all. These advances must be incorporated into the curriculum and outmoded courses must be discarded.

Along with the new knowledge discovered in the subject fields or scholarly disciplines, research has uncovered new and valuable techniques in human relations and communication. In public relations and in new teaching methods, to name but two, evidence is at hand that curriculum revision is long overdue. There is every reason to believe that despite the increase in knowledge gained in recent years, proper delineation and better teaching can bring about a reduction in the time students must remain within the institution.

Considerable resistance has been brought to bear on those attempting to tamper with the curriculum. Vested academic interests make revision and changes difficult to the point where many presidents, deans and trustees have nearly given up trying to effect change and modification in this area. But if we are to accomplish the kind of space age training and education so imperative in these troubled times, we must not fear change; we must courageously cut out the trivia and increase the important subjects in the curriculum.

Extra-curricular possibilities provide other challenges for higher education. For many years, sports and social events comprising the bulk of the extra-curricular offering were thought of as not really educational. They were considered rather relaxing diversionary pursuits for the students. During the last few years, however, it has been conclusively proven that well planned and executed extra-

(Continued on p. 40)

"Examination of the progress which elementary education has made in the last century, half-century and quarter-century, and a look at the status of elementary education as it exists today in the better schools are most encouraging."

Elementary Education Today

BY CLARENCE HINES

Professor of Education, University of Oregon

IN ANY DISCUSSION of elementary education today, the wide range that must be covered is almost unbelievable. Elementary schools are so diverse in the many qualities which characterize them as to bear little resemblance to one another. Perhaps there was a time in the history of elementary education in the United States when it could be said that, "This is elementary education," at a time when elementary schools and their instructional programs resembled one another enough to bear a striking resemblance, but this certainly is not true in 1961.

Elementary education today is being carried on in schools which range from the one-room country school to the largest city elementary school system. The instructional program which is offered the children varies from some that are almost as traditional as those of a century ago, to the most progressive usually found in the more wealthy suburban areas of large metropolitan centers. Elementary teachers in the public schools of the country have training which ranges from little more than high school graduation to the master's degree or beyond. In school plant, elementary schools range from those in which the "facilities" are still out back in

small white or unpainted buildings to those very modern structures which provide everything including educational television.

This heterogeneity of elementary schools and elementary education makes it difficult, if not impossible, to say that "This is elementary education today." Rather, it makes it necessary to identify the observable trends and better practices in elementary education and elementary schools and to say that this is what appears to be the best in elementary education today. There are a number of these trends and practices but for purposes of this discussion, attention will be centered on four which appear to have major significance. These are school population, plant, staff and instructional program.

The school population, or those who go to elementary school today and are the beneficiaries of the education offered, is important for both its quantity and its nature. The school plant is important because the facilities being provided determine to a very considerable extent the effectiveness of the job that can be done. The staff, or those who work in the schools, particularly the professionals, largely determine the quality of the education offered. The instructional program, that is, what is taught, how and with what materials, is the very heart of elementary education whether it be in the one-room school or in the largest elementary school in the country. These four factors, then, deserve major attention.

The School Population

The number of children attending the elementary schools of the country today is amazing to anyone who has not kept in close touch with the figures. It is constantly in-

Clarence Hines was previously superintendent of schools, Eugene, Oregon, from 1946 to 1958. In 1958-1959 he was on assignment from the University of Oregon as educational consultant to the government of Nepal in the fields of teacher training and secondary education. He has contributed many articles to educational journals.

creasing, and the end is not yet in sight. During the current year, 1960-1961, it is estimated that no fewer than 25,265,620 children are enrolled.¹ This is 726,000 more than a year ago, a three per cent increase. The growth which has taken place in the past decade is impressive. In the 1950-1951 school year, there were 19,010,554 in the elementary schools. Enrollment has increased 32.9 per cent in ten years. The total enrollment in the elementary and secondary schools of the country ten years ago was 25,794,510 or only about 1.5 million more than are presently enrolled in the elementary schools alone. Elementary school enrollment in the various states ranges from some 35,000 in Alaska and 45,572 in Delaware in the continental United States, to New York's 1,726,000. All in all, this tremendous number of children, increasing at the rate of approximately three per cent a year, for a decade, constitute a real challenge to elementary education today from the standpoint of sheer numbers to say nothing of the wide range in ability represented at every grade level and in every subject area.

Various factors, other than the high birth rate of the past 15 years, appear to be operating to bring about the large increase in elementary school attendance. Not the least significant of these are the improved economic conditions which make it possible for more parents to send their children to school at least through the first eight grades. Twenty-five years ago, during the depression years, many parents simply did not have the money to buy books, clothes and the other things necessary to make it possible for their children to attend school. In some instances, older children in the family would, after completing the first four or five grades, have to remain at home to help with the chores, take care of younger children or, in the case of rural families, work on the farm. The increased urbanization of the population and more adequate family income now make it possible from an economic standpoint for parents to send their children to school and allow them to remain there until they finish eight grades.

¹ All figures in this paragraph are from *Estimates of School Statistics, 1960-61*, Research Report of the National Education Association, Washington, D. C., December, 1960, pp. 5-8. Office of Education figures approximate these quite closely.

² *Estimates of School Statistics, 1960-61*, p. 7.

Another factor, and perhaps the most important one operating to keep children in school, is the compulsory attendance law which requires attendance, usually from ages seven through 16. In some instances, states require attendance from age seven until the child completes high school or until age 18, whichever occurs first. Exceptions to the compulsory school attendance laws are usually allowed when satisfactory home instruction is furnished or when children live in remote areas not served by school bus transportation. The school bus has been a great equalizer of educational opportunity by bringing a modern elementary school program within the reach of children who live long distances from the school. It not only brings the child to the school, but, in many instances, it brings enough children together to provide a satisfactory operational unit for a better school program. It has, as much as any other single factor, aided in the demise of the ungraded one-room school so long characteristic of the country's rural areas.

The requirements for employment in modern industrial society tend to make an "eighth grade education," that is, completion of the elementary school, mandatory. There are few opportunities for employment today which do not require that the applicant be able to read, write and do some of the arithmetical processes. Even ditch digging, the traditional role of the uneducated worker, is now done by power machinery requiring that the operator be able to read and understand both servicing and operational manuals. Many of the employment opportunities demand a high school diploma, or at least attendance through the first two years of high school, for which completion of the eighth grade is required as a base for continuing high school work.

The American goal of "All of the children of all of the people" in school is well on its way to being realized as the seventh decade of the twentieth century opens. Not all of them are yet enrolled, but the vast majority are attending either public, parochial or private schools. It is estimated that there were 45,044,000 children and youth between the ages of five and 17 in 1960 and a total of 37,244,284 were enrolled in school.² This means that 82.7 per cent of all children were in school, a substantial approach to the goal

of universal public education for which the leaders of the country have long striven. It is not too much to expect that within the next decade or so, as roads are improved further, economic conditions become even better and the desire for education is transmitted through the family environment to the children, an even closer approach to the 100 per cent goal will be achieved.

The School Plant

Elementary school plant facilities have increased substantially in both quantity and quality during the years since World War II. In 1950-1951, there were slightly more than 600,000 elementary classroom teachers, and today there are more than 857,000.³ Since most elementary teachers have their individual classrooms, it is a reasonable assumption that the increase in elementary classrooms has been proportionate to the increase in the number of teachers. The increase in teachers having been almost 42 per cent, the increase in classrooms has likely been about the same. This increase is almost exactly 10 per cent more than the increase in elementary school enrollment during the same period. The gain, however, is offset by the relief of some of the already overcrowded classrooms in 1950 and the general obsolescence of many of the schoolrooms then in use.

What is today's typical modern elementary school building like? How does it differ from the traditional one-room rural school of a generation ago or the box-like structure, usually two or three stories in height, which was characteristic of school architecture in our more populous areas? Certain obvious differences are immediately apparent to the most casual observer. Today's modern elementary school building is a single story structure of 12 to 30 classrooms, arranged in "fingers," "clusters," "wings," or "groups," usually separating the different grade levels. Each classroom has its own outside exit in addition to the corridor or breezeway door customarily found in classrooms. The building is light, airy and has an abundance of glass. It is aesthetically pleasing to the observer's eye, makes use of texture and mass as its chief architectural attributes, and is constructed of masonry or wood, whichever material has

the strongest support in local tradition. It is a plant designed as the most useful tool in the instruction of children and one that will serve the community well for many adult community activities.

The modern elementary classroom today is larger and more nearly square than its traditional predecessor. Whereas classrooms of a generation ago were limited in width by the 24-foot length of dimension lumber, today's classrooms make use of light weight wood or steel trusses or laminated beams to span widths of 30 feet or more thus giving the typical room dimensions of 30 feet by 30, 32 or 34 feet. With standards requiring 30 square feet of floor area for each child, because of the greater space required for an instructional program that includes greater pupil activity, classrooms must have 900 square feet of floor area or more for a class of 30 children, the class size objective in most elementary schools. The square shape of the room tends also to bring the teacher closer to the children and makes possible a better instructional situation.

Classrooms are further characterized by sink and work areas, reading and science areas and movable furniture. The walls are finished in pastel, non-glare colors which add to their aesthetic beauty. There is an abundance of both natural and artificial light. Windows on two sides of the room, often on three, provide so much natural light in some instances that outside louvers or inside shades are necessary to control it. In addition, some rooms make use of top-lighting by means of directional glass block set in panels or sky-lights of plastic shaped into small domes. The corridors in a modern elementary school are often as well lighted in terms of foot lumens as the classrooms of a quarter of a century ago. Many of the primary classrooms have their own toilet facilities thus eliminating the need for toilet rooms in the sections of the building where primary children are housed. Altogether the modern classroom gives the occupant feeling of spaciousness, and of comfort. It is a pleasant place in which to learn.

Certain special facilities have come to be considered essential in elementary education today. Most important among these, at least from the standpoint of size, is the multi-purpose, or multi-use, room. This room

³ *Estimates of School Statistics, 1960-61*, p. 10.

often the size of two or three classrooms, is used for play, for assembly, and for lunch in schools with the first six grades. In schools with eight grades, there may be a gymnasium with a hardwood floor and with dressing rooms and showers for athletics and departmentalized classes in physical education. Since the multi-purpose room is commonly used for the lunchroom, a kitchen for the preparation of hot foods is usually a part of it. The school lunch program has become an accepted part of elementary school operation in many communities due to the Federal School Lunch Program, Federal Surplus Commodities and the many working mothers in today's society.

The school library is a major feature in the instructional program of the modern elementary school. It is usually the most pleasant and best lighted room in the building, often with a northern exposure to avoid glare and provide a more even and uniform natural light. It has tables and chairs adequate to seat at least one full class and often two or three classes at a time. It is filled with attractive books covering almost every conceivable subject of interest to boys and girls. The library is a place for learning about things and for learning to love books.

Other special facilities required for elementary education today include a health suite, administrative offices and workroom, teachers' room, a remedial instruction room, and storerooms. The health suite provides space for cots for children who become ill at school, for the nurse to examine children, and for the doctor to immunize them in mass immunizations. It is indicative of the feeling of responsibility which the elementary school has for the health of the child as it is related to his learning.

The administrative offices in a modern elementary building are not the "cubby-hole" type in some isolated corner, or under some stairway, as was so common in older buildings. Today's offices provide public space, work space for the secretary-clerk and private office for the principal. Often in conjunction with, or adjacent to, the office is a teachers' social room and workroom where teachers can relax for a few minutes or prepare assignments for their classes. Another room generally found in close proximity to the office is the remedial instruction

and testing room. Such a room is usually adequate for 10 or 15 children who may be brought together for small group instruction to overcome a learning or physical handicap, under the direction of a special teacher. In addition to an office storeroom, often large enough for the instructional supplies for the entire school, other storerooms are provided throughout the building for use by the custodian and for the storage of instructional supplies for special purposes such as art and physical education.

The school site is an important part of the physical plant of today's elementary school. It plays an important role in elementary education. Standards generally require a minimum of five acres with one acre additional for each 100 children enrolled. This is a far cry from the minimum of one-half or one acre sites of past school generations. Sites today include modern roadways which must be constructed to carry the weight of heavy bus loads of children as well as routine deliveries of fuel and other supplies. Roadways, drives and walks connect with covered bus loading areas to provide greater safety and protection for the children.

Play areas on the school site are usually arranged according to the age of the children who will use them. Centers are provided for the activities of primary, intermediate and upper grade children, often separated by natural divisions of the building itself. Upper grade children have equipment such as backstops for softball or baseball, basketball courts and other large group game activities. Intermediate children use some of the same type of equipment as the upper grades, but they are still young enough to use such things as swings, parallel bars and seesaws. Small children find much to intrigue them in the concrete and steel replicas of animals, and in concrete block platforms and other things which appeal to the active mind of the young child.

The School Staff

The classroom teacher is the key to an effective program of elementary education today just as she was in the Dame School of colonial days or in the grade schools of the country 100 years ago. The classroom teacher is still a woman in six out of seven

elementary classrooms today by virtue of the fact that women outnumber men by almost six to one as teachers of the elementary grades. In 1960-1961, there were 857,353 elementary teachers of whom 125,477 were men and 731,876 were women.⁴ There has been a noticeable increase in the number of men, however, since World War II.

Aside from the fact that there are still more women than men teaching in the elementary schools, there is little resemblance between today's teachers and those of the early part of the century or even of 25 years ago. The increased requirements for certification of elementary teachers, as well as secondary, have made the teacher with a term or two of "Normal School" a thing of the past. The bachelor's degree has become the minimum standard in today's better elementary schools with the master's degree requirement already here or in the immediate offing in the more exacting school systems.

Perhaps it is in the versatility required of the teacher in elementary education today that she most resembles the teacher of years ago. The modern teacher in the self-contained classroom, which is characteristic of today's elementary school, must be versatile indeed. She must be able to teach not only the 3 R's but a variety of other things, art, music and physical education being the most common, along with history, geography and science. The subject matter of courses required to teach so many things effectively is almost enough to fill a four-year college course without the professional preparation required for teacher certification.

Elementary schools which do not operate on the basis of the self-contained classroom provide special subject teachers who go from room to room, often on a daily but usually on a two or three times a week basis, instructing the children in their specialties. In most schools, when special subject teachers are employed, they teach arts and crafts, vocal and instrumental music, and health and physical education. Their preparation in the special subject area is far more extensive than the classroom teacher's can possibly be.

Another group of special teachers is the one for remedial instruction. Society is showing an increased sense of responsibility

for the handicapped child, regardless of the nature of his handicap. The better elementary schools today provide, by means of special teachers, for the instruction of children with special needs. Children with reading difficulties, the emotionally disturbed, and those with hearing, vision and speech handicaps receive instruction in overcoming their difficulties from specially trained teachers. Such instruction is of great assistance to the child, and it is valuable assistance for the regular teacher who may have neither the time nor the special training to teach such children effectively.

The principal of a school which provides elementary education today is no longer the "head teacher" in most schools but is a real administrator and supervisor of elementary education. He will commonly have at least a bachelor's degree, often a master's, with special training in supervision, curriculum, administration, school plant operation and finance. In states which require a special credential or certificate for principals, he will be required to have had from three to five years of successful teaching experience to qualify for the administrator's credential. In any good school system, he will not be considered for promotion to vice-principal or principal until and unless he has demonstrated teaching competency of a high order. The vice-principal, found in the larger schools only, may be younger and less experienced than the principal but otherwise must meet the same requirements. A small proportion of present day elementary schools provide some guidance and counseling personnel but this responsibility has customarily fallen on the principal and teachers. The guidance program in the elementary school is slowly getting started. It has been slow to get under way, probably due to the fact that the problems of younger children are believed to be less acute, that funds for this sort of service have been limited in most school districts, and that demands from the secondary level have been greater.

The better elementary schools in the large school systems have consultant services available in the subject areas. These are offered to the regular classroom teacher on a regular schedule or "on call" basis when the teacher becomes aware of a need for help with some special problem in instruction. In the acad-

⁴ *Estimates of School Statistics, 1960-61*, pp. 10-11.

demetic areas, consultant services are most often provided in the language arts, science and mathematics; in the special subjects, in art, music and physical education. The consultants, like the principal, must first have demonstrated their competency as successful and effective classroom teachers and then have added extensive preparation in their specialties as well as special training in working with teachers. Consultants in the psychological services, such as testing, working with the emotionally disturbed, gifted, slow learners and handicapped, are also available to help classroom teachers.

Non-certificated personnel, that is, those who are not required by law to have a valid teaching certificate in order to hold their positions, usually fall into four categories in today's elementary school. These are the health, food, office and custodial services. The most important health worker in the modern elementary school is the school nurse. She may be an employee of the school district, of the city, or of the county but she makes regular calls at the school to see children and frequently makes home calls where conditions indicate that such are necessary. Some schools have the services of a full or part-time school physician; others have dental services available at least for inspection. These services in no way substitute for or replace the services of the family physician or dentist but they do supplement them. They are evidence of the school's recognition of the relationship between the child's physical well being and his ability to learn in school.

Food service employees may consist of nutritionists, school lunch managers, cooks and helpers. As the school lunch program has grown, due to federal aid, increased prosperity and changing home conditions, the number of employees in this category has materially increased. Many communities would not consider that their school was adequately meeting the needs of the whole child if it did not have a hot lunch program with an adequate staff. Office workers, usually one for each eight or ten classrooms, consist of secretaries and clerks. They relieve principals and teachers of duties which can be done as well by one less highly trained than professional, and thus free their superiors or more responsible duties. A single cus-

todian will take care of most of the work of today's 10 or 12-room elementary school but as schools become larger, he must have assistance. This is frequently provided by a matron who does much of the cleaning, especially in the parts of the building used by the younger children.

The Instructional Program

Some schools group for elementary education today in one way and some in others; all ways have their exponents. Some grouping is done for educational reasons and others for reasons which are purely administrative. Where maximum use of buildings is the primary consideration, educational advantages and disadvantages of grouping may be ignored. Elementary schools are commonly organized on a Grades 1-8, inclusive, basis. There is a notable trend, however, toward the elementary school of only the first six grades with the upper grades, seven and eight, being placed in a departmentalized or junior high school type of organization. Where kindergartens exist, and they do not exist as a part of a majority of American elementary schools today, they are simply another unit in the six-grade or eight-grade type of organization.

Two other types of grouping for instruction, in addition to the traditional grade grouping, are found in many elementary schools today. They are grouping by ability and grouping by subject or department. After trying ability grouping in the 1920's and abandoning it, elementary schools in the post-sputnik era appear to be giving consideration to it again. Where it is being used, factors taken into consideration in grouping are intelligence, special ability, past achievement and physical and mental maturity. Teacher judgment is an important factor in the placing of a child in a group, especially in a track program in which children presumably advance at a slow, average or fast rate. The early identification and segregation of both the gifted child and the slow learner, and the most effective methods of educating them, are foremost in the minds of many American educators today.

The self-contained classroom, in which one teacher teaches all subjects, has been the goal and the practice in most elementary schools in times past. Departmentalization

through the platoon school type of organization, popular in the 1920's, lost favor and for a time elementary education made the swing back to the self-contained classroom. Now, however, the trend appears to have reversed itself and the pendulum is swinging toward departmentalization again, at least in the upper grades. The demand for a better quality of education in the elementary school, in the years since sputnik, and the belief that departmentalization is the way to get it are chiefly responsible for the change. Exponents of the self-contained classroom point to the advantage of having the child, particularly the young child, with one teacher for all of his instruction. Those who favor departmentalization, however, contend that it is impossible to have a single teacher with adequate educational background to be equally effective in the teaching of all subjects which must be taught in the elementary classroom. The advantage of specialists in each subject area, they point out, far offsets any disadvantage of not having the child with one teacher all of the time. Those schools which have departmentalized for purposes of elementary education at the upper grade level have, in general, followed a plan of having students with the homeroom teacher for at least one-half of the day.

The strongest argument made for departmentalization of the upper grades is that it allows for instruction by specialists with the result that better education can be given the pupil. In particular, if subjects such as industrial arts and homemaking are to be offered in the seventh and eighth grades, departmentalization makes the task easier and instruction better. Dr. James B. Conant, in his recent survey of the American junior high school, has offered strong support to those who favor departmentalization of the upper grades whether organized as a part of a junior high school or of an eight-grade elementary school.

There are those who say that elementary education today is placing greater emphasis on the fundamentals, the so-called "Three R's," than has been placed on them for years. It is probably true that there is more talk about greater emphasis than there has been for years but it is doubtful whether teachers are placing any more emphasis on them, or whether they could if they tried.

The fact of the matter is, as any active school supervisor can testify, that good teachers everywhere have been giving their pupils good instruction in the Three R's for generations. The only limitation on this has been not one of intention on the part of the teacher, but rather that of the teacher's ability to do so. The actual situation appears to be that the public is now giving attention to the problems of instruction which have concerned teachers for some time.

Reading, particularly, has come in for more than its fair share of attention in connection with charges that the fundamentals have been de-emphasized by progressive educators or some other group. The alleged failure to teach phonics, or to use phonics as a means of teaching children to read, has been the chief focus of the criticism which has been leveled. Again, the better teachers in the elementary school today are using the best methods they know to teach reading as well as the other subjects they are charged with the responsibility for teaching. They certainly use phonics as well as word identification and other methods. The ever-increasing use of both public and school libraries is evidence that those going through school are learning to read and that they enjoy reading. The more extreme methods and procedures of progressive education have fallen by the wayside, just as extremes have a way of doing in fields other than education. The good that there was in the movement has been taken over by teachers and made a part of their working methods. This is the way progress is made.

The special subjects play an important role in elementary education today. For the most part, they are no longer extra-curricular but have become an integral part of the learning experiences to which every child is entitled. Not all schools as yet offer art, music, physical education, industrial arts and homemaking as part of their programs of elementary education but the better ones do. Even in schools which do not, there is general recognition of the value of these subjects in the education of children. Wherever and wherever a teacher with special ability, interest or training in any one of the special subjects exists, use is made of that special talent to enrich the program of the class or that school. The teacher may t

there for only a year or two but the pupils during her stay will have enjoyed a richer learning experience than would otherwise have been their lot.

Two other subjects, generally considered to belong to the secondary curriculum, have made their way into the offerings of elementary education today. These are foreign languages and algebra. Traditionally, algebra has been considered the mathematics course for the ninth grade, the first year of the four-year high school. Today, it is being offered to a select group of pupils in the eighth grade and plane geometry has become the first year high school subject for those who wish to take it.

A number of factors have influenced the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary school. Among these are the increased travel of Americans abroad for personal, business and governmental reasons, the position of the United States in world affairs, European education, particularly Russian, which begins the teaching of English and languages other than the native in the elementary schools, and a feeling that learning a foreign language at whatever level is better education than one has without learning it. While not widespread in practice as yet, foreign languages in today's elementary school curriculum are receiving a great deal of attention. The more advanced elementary schools furnish evidence that much can be done with languages at this level and that they can contribute substantially to the education of children and youth.

The materials of instruction used in elementary education today are being improved constantly in both quality and variety. Textbooks, which have been good for many years now, are even better. Typography and illustrations have improved along with content. The audio-visual aids for learning—films, slides, maps, globes and charts, are significant additions to elementary school teaching and learning experiences. Radio and television have been brought in to draw the classroom closer to the outside world of which it is a part but without the children having to leave it to share some national and world-wide experiences.

Elementary education today makes abundant use of the resources of the community to strengthen the curriculum. In every com-

munity, there are many individuals with special talents or training who are willing to use their abilities for the education of children. There are areas of learning in every community also—business and industrial plants, stores, government offices, museums, to name only a few, which are being used as community laboratories for learning by the better elementary schools. A few schools, too, have ventured into the area of the community or school camp as an outdoor learning experience and have found it to have real value.

That which has been said above represents elementary education today, or at least the greatest common denominator of it. What of the future, what does it hold for the children who will attend elementary schools in the years ahead? Some things appear to stand out sufficiently to indicate trends. There is every indication that the number of children in school will continue to increase. This will be due not only to the fact that more will go to school but also because more will remain in it. It seems likely that the drawing and holding power will be increased noticeably in the homes of children with economically and socially limited backgrounds.

The school plant will see further adaptations of its facilities. There will be changes made to accommodate team teaching, the use of teacher assistants and teacher aides. Some of the newer schools have already done this. There will be increased provision for the use of television. It will be used to teach those things which it can teach better, as well as being used in closed circuit to observe children and how they respond to learning situations.

The school staff may be expected to have additional and higher training requirements in all categories. The demand for a better quality of education and for more professional salaries will result in standards being raised. More members of the staff will work eleven months of the year than nine. There will be greater specialization, through the extension of departmentalization or grouping, with master teachers and assistants in each area. The number of pupils for each teacher, that is, class size, will be reduced which will mean additional staff members in the typical school. There will be increased attention to the health and welfare of both pupils and teachers.

In the area of the curriculum, it appears certain that man's ingenuity will result in continued improvement of textbooks and other printed materials. The use of teaching machines to expedite learning and to save valuable teacher time will be greatly expanded as these are perfected and become available. In the content area, there is likely to be continued extension downward into the elementary school of some high school subjects such as foreign language and typewriting. As more effective means are found of teaching the skill subjects, it may be expected that the general content of the elementary curriculum will be broadened.

Examination of the progress which elementary education has made in the last century, half-century and quarter-century, and a look at the status of elementary education as it exists today in the better schools are most encouraging. Children today are offered more and better opportunities for learning than was the lot of most of their predecessors. Perhaps the most hopeful sign of all, as the future is surveyed, is the fact that neither parents nor teachers give any indication that they want anything but the best for the children of America. With this kind of desire from those most vitally concerned in elementary education, it can only continue to move ahead.

(Continued from p. 31)

curricular programs can have tremendous educational, cultural and physical effect.

The classroom or laboratory is not the only place on campus where learning takes place. Indeed, there are some who say that much more quantitative and qualitative learning takes place in the extra-curricular programs. When one considers how little time is spent in actual lectures, labs and conferences, one sees that all the other waking hours should have some value toward the purpose for which a student attends college—to grow in spirit, mind and body.

As more people realize what a wonderful challenge is offered higher education to do a bigger and better job through the extra-curricular program, more colleges and universities are investing time and money in this expanding area. Traditional forms, such as

sports and social events, are being evaluated and improved, while new forms such as student government, independent study and special travel are being brought to the fore

Meeting the Challenges

Higher education today is in much the same situation that President Kennedy describes as the state of the nation. There are serious problems that threaten it and there are magnificent opportunities that challenge it. Given the appropriate understanding by the public, adequate lay leadership by trustees, insightful professional leadership by administrators, and inspired teaching by faculty members, higher education today—and tomorrow—will rise to new heights of service to the nation and to humanity.

"Has it ever occurred to you that physically, pound for pound, man is one of the weakest creatures on earth? . . . Fortunately, however, he has developed a capacity that has enabled him largely to overcome his physical handicaps: he has developed an intelligence by which he learned many generations ago how to project what little strength he had through use of such tools as the stone axe, . . . the bow and arrow, . . . and the wheel. Most importantly, he discovered that his fellow-man could be his most useful and effective tool, so to speak. He found that by working with others he could do many things that were beyond his powers when working alone. He might even persuade some of those others to do his work for him.

"But he also found out that mere numbers were not enough: those numbers had to exert their efforts in the same direction. . . ."—*Giles Wilkeson Gray, Emeritus Professor of Speech, Louisiana State University, in a Baton Rouge, La., radio station broadcast, March 19, 1961.*

Discussing the challenges facing secondary education, this author points out that "... a horse and buggy education cannot possibly meet the demands of the modern space age. Despite the many critical books, conferences and reports, confusion, lack of uniformity, and inequality of educational opportunity exist, and some overall planning by the federal government seems to be the answer. To contend otherwise and expect success would be like entering a race against jet planes with the original Kitty Hawk airplane."

Secondary Education Today

BY C. A. HAUBERG

Associate Professor of History, St. Olaf College

[T has been said that war is "too important to be left to generals." Apparently the American public thinks education is too important to be left to specialists in education. Complacency about education characterized the first three or four decades of the present century, but during and after World War II criticism became very pronounced. The teaching of American history was attacked in a series of articles in *The New York Times* that were carried by other newspapers in the early 1940's. Henry F. Pringle renewed the attacks in a *Post* article of January 20, 1945. Acting in action by these charges, three professional organizations—the National Council of Social Studies, the American Historical Association and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association—prepared and published a report which indicated that pupils in the public schools were exposed to three and a half courses in United States history. The report, however, called for better trained teachers and outlined a program with other suggestions for improvement.¹

Such criticism was mild in comparison to that which broke in successive waves after World War II. Apparently the first swell grew out of frustration caused by the war and international problems, and resulted in

attacks on academic freedom and varied forms of witch-hunting.

Although this wave, somewhat spent, is still with us, another trend appeared in the 1950's. The book titles *Quackery in the Public Schools*, *Educational Wastelands*, *And Madly Teach* as well as *Why Can't Johnny Read* indicate the nature of the charges. Although the picture drawn in these publications was often extreme (*Blackboard Jungle*, for example), such writing did represent much serious thought regarding standards in the public schools.² Unfortunately many of the professional educators did not see the distinction between the earlier criticism and the later trend. Hence the Great Debate ensues with the proponents of progressivism on the one side, the subject matter traditionalists on the other.³

C. A. Hauberg held a Social Science Research Council Grant in the 1950's to investigate the economic and social history of Panama. He was a visiting professor at the University of Panama "summer session," 1954. He has published articles in the fields of history, the social sciences and education, has served as a consultant in these fields, and has traveled extensively in Latin America. Currently he is working on a textbook on Latin American history. He has taught social studies in high schools and junior colleges here and in the Canal Zone.

Edgar B. Wesley (Editor), *American History in Schools and Colleges* (Macmillan, 1944).
 Paul Woodring, *A Fourth of a Nation* (McGraw-Hill, 1971), p. 7 ff. See also James D. Finn, "The Good Guys and Bad Guys," *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 1958, p. 2 ff. The periodical is the official publication of the professional fraternity of men in education. The article mentioned includes a list of most of the critical writings published with comments by the author, which tend to favor the "educational" point of view. The magazine carries articles presenting the opposite point of view however.
Ibid., November, 1958.

The Great Debate revolves around the interpretation, criticism or misinterpretation of pragmatism—Dewey preferred the terms instrumentalism or experimentalism. This philosophy arose because of dissatisfaction with classic or traditional philosophy and was advocated by John Dewey, William James and others. In connection with education John Dewey emphasized: "Education is a 'social process,' " education is "not preparation for life but is life itself," the "whole child," pupils' "needs" and we "learn by doing."

Obviously, Dewey has been sinned against more by his advocates or friends than by his enemies. Many of his concepts were misunderstood and carried to extremes far beyond his intentions. Many of his followers limited "doing" to manual acts only. Dewey, for example, would consider listening to a lecture and utilizing the ideas *functionally* as a high type of doing. In this sense the progressivism which grew out of pragmatism was a revolt against the materialism of the nineteenth century.

Classic philosophy claimed absolute values but the practices of the prevailing materialism were often far removed from these beliefs or ideals. And a doctrine of absolutism without a corresponding content can become vicious. Pragmatism, then, developed as an antithesis to the old classic thesis. The pragmatist did not exactly deny values but intended that education should be a process of finding them.

Robert Ulich questions the absence of values in Dewey's philosophy. How, lacking them, could he use such terms as "moral foundation," the "law of life" as well as "the identification of the divine with ideal ends"?

Whether one gives the name of "God" to this union, operative in thought and action, is a matter for individual decision. But the *function* of such a working union of the ideal and actual seems to me to be identical with the force that has in fact been attached to the conception of God in all the religions that have a spiritual

content; and a clear idea of that function seems to me urgently needed at the present time.⁴

The progressive movement attempted to bring this identification of ideals and practices down to the lower levels of learning. In a real sense it was an expression of the American way of life. It was, of course, no educational plot as some present critics would imply but arose because of the confusion and frustration caused by the disparity between the spiritual ideals and the sordid practices of materialism.

At any rate John Q. Public was aroused, and apparently he wants to get his money's worth in the future by making educational policy his concern. This interest was further accentuated or heightened in the fall of 1957 by Sputnik I, which produced a veritable rash of articles, books, and pamphlets concerned with the problems of education. Metropolitan papers devoted much space to education: *Life* ran a series on the "Crisis in Education" (1959); in the fall of 1960 the *Saturday Review* started a new supplement, "Education in America," edited by Paul Woodring.⁵

And well might the public be concerned; over 48 million persons in the United States were attending schools, with 10,240,000 in high schools, and these were supervised by 527,059 secondary school teachers. From the United States Office of Education came forecasts of large increases in the immediate future. Furthermore, important and serious questions were being asked: Are we ignoring the gifted child? Is the school plant being used sufficiently? Is science being overstressed because of Sputnik? And what of standards in general?

Besides the popular interest, many serious conferences were convened and these in turn resulted in numerous reports. Late in 1958 the University of Chicago and the National Citizens' Council for Better Schools invited over a thousand leading educators, scholars and laymen to concentrate on the topic "The American High School—Challenge of a New Era." Throughout 1958, James Bryant Conant, with a generous grant from the Carnegie Corporation, investigated some 5 schools in 18 states and published a report on the comprehensive high school; this resulted in reports on the report both before and after it came out.⁶ In 1960, President

⁴ Quoted in Robert Ulich, *History of Educational Thought* (American Book Company, 1950), p. 335; Also Woodring, *op. cit.*, Chapter III; Philip Olgin, *Phi Delta Kappan*, May, 1957; "John Dewey and the Luce Ends of Education," *Ibid.*, December, 1958.

⁵ September 17, 1960. *The Saturday Review* carries its excellent supplements on this topic once a month.

⁶ James Bryant Conant, *The American High School To-Day* (McGraw-Hill, 1959), *Phi Delta Kappan*, November, 1958; Robert H. Beck et. al., *The Conant Report*, Social Science Research Center (University of Minnesota, 1959).

Eisenhower appointed 11 distinguished Americans to consider goals in education. This resulted in a report edited by Dr. John W. Gardner.⁷ Another distinguished group of 35 scientists and scholars met at Woods Hole, Cape Cod, in the fall of 1959 and produced a small monograph, *The Process of Education*, edited by Jerome S. Bruner (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1960).

The public was deeply aroused and wanted answers. If "democracy has to be born anew every generation and education is the midwife," the excitement over education was a sign of health and vigor.⁸ Furthermore, not all the observations were unfavorable. Earl J. McGrath, former United States Commissioner of Education, called the United States system the best in the world, and Henry Steele Commager stated that in essence the schools were victims of their own success because their chief problem had been to integrate the various nationalities which had come as immigrants from Europe:

After all, Americans, the products of our educational system, succeeded in a great many things which involve intelligence and judgment. They established a nation and held it together, expanding thirteen to forty-eight states with less difficulty than England had with Ireland alone in the same period. They made democracy work reasonably well and did not gratify the expectations of those who were so sure that a majority would inevitably exercise tyranny over minorities. They elected mediocre presidents, but never a wicked or a dangerous one. They never yielded to a military dictator. They settled all their problems, but one, by compromise and concession instead of by violence (and perhaps that one could not be solved by compromise).⁹

Moreover, added this historian, the schools had never been passive agents in serving the needs of our society; apparently economic and social changes necessitate parallel changes in the educational program.

Inasmuch as the "comprehensive high

school" was really the product of the Progressive Movement the construction program for some time had been for bigger and better schools. Industrial shops, giant auditoriums, audio-visual rooms, luxurious lunchrooms, spacious gymnasiums, and stadiums had already made their appearance along with libraries and laboratories. After 1957 this policy continued and other additions were recommended. Conant in his report is critical of the small schools; none should have a smaller graduating class than 100. Emphases on education in depth and independent study in the sciences as well as the social studies have resulted in more stress upon laboratories, with special conference rooms for discussion and critical thinking. The "School for Tomorrow" will apparently make great use of audio-visual devices, tapes, slides and films with appropriate rooms—even teaching machines might be used.¹⁰

In order fully to utilize these magnificent plants, summer sessions have been advocated and tried, to care for the bulging enrollments and to provide more opportunity for the gifted child as well as the slow learner. Despite the deep concern caused by the cold war and Russian scientific progress much money, too much according to many observers, continues to be lavished on athletic programs and coaches who can win games. Henry Steele Commager, Robert M. Hutchins, Paul Woodring and James Bryant Conant decry this practice and drastic curtailments have been suggested.¹¹

In this welter of confusion regarding buildings, teaching aids, television circuits, and other special equipment sane heads realize that the basic factor in improvement must rest with the quality of the teachers and the basic educational program offered. But what is basic?

In the confusion of attack, counter-attack, proposals and counter-proposals, the only thing one can be sure of is that most of the people desire some change. Sober observers wonder what has become of the three R's and question "Dynamic Fly Casting" as a necessary and integral part of the curriculum.¹² It is difficult to explain all the reasons for the criticism and the desire for change, and apparently the causes vary. Possibly America is coming of age and the new rich are demanding more real "culture."

⁷ Paul Woodring, *Saturday Review*, December 17, 1960.

⁸ John Dewey, Quoted in Merle Curti, *The Social Ideas of American Educators* (Pageant Book, 1959), p. 499.

⁹ Francis S. Chase & Harold A. Anderson (Editors), *The High School in the New Era* (University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 6.

¹⁰ Charles R. Foster, "Frontier Thinking and Bold Action in Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, January, 1960.

¹¹ Robert M. Hutchins, *Some Observations in American Education* (Cambridge University Press, 1956), Chapter II: Chase and Anderson, *op. cit.*, p. 11 ff; Woodring, *op. cit.*, p. 134 ff., *Phi Delta Kappan*, April, 1961.

¹² Woodring, *op. cit.*, Chapter IX.

Global responsibilities may have caused many thoughtful people to question the efficacy of the old system. The latter explanation seems to be the most reasonable because most of the reasoned criticism came shortly after World War II. As a result of increased travel during the war and the many cultural exchange programs, stress upon a knowledge of foreign languages could be expected. Economic, social as well as political problems seemed to challenge the social studies areas as well as the humanities in general. Then came Sputnik I and for a time the emphasis was heavily in favor of mathematics, physics and chemistry. Standards in these subjects were raised, new textbooks were written, and summer workshops were promoted for the gifted, college-bound prospective scientists. Happily there were some observers calm enough to understand the frustration of fear and courageous enough to demand a balanced liberal program. One visiting scholar observed in Minneapolis that all scientific achievement in the past has upset the balance in man's conscious and unconscious awareness. "It is this balance that must be regained before we can have any measure of peace."¹³

Scholars as well as leaders in public life cautioned against too close a cooperation between science and government and the military.¹⁴ In the field of education some spoke of science as the "new religion," and Robert M. Hutchins pointed out that "The overwhelming problems of our country are how to make democracy a reality, how to survive in the nuclear age, and what to do with ourselves if we do survive. None of these problems are technological. . . .¹⁵ It appeared that our planning in education would be unsuccessful if the allotment of time, energy and space varied (science to humanities) directly with the number of astronauts put into space.

It should be clear that ours is the first civilization in history where it might be possible for all people to share the fruits of our heri-

tage. Many feared that this precious heritage could blow up, and education must play the rôle of a major determinant in this world of dynamic change. "Human welfare everywhere depends upon the conjunction of technological power and democratic freedoms. Without the first, men are slaves to nature; without the second, slaves to one another. Neither is possible without education. Neither can be advanced without organized scholarship. . . ."¹⁶

Outwardly at least, the public was aroused regarding quality schools; and scholars, educators and laymen were voicing their opinions. The government and various foundations sponsored conferences and reports, the most recent of which, *The American High School Today*, by Conant, has apparently caused the greatest thought and discussion. This is a fair evaluation of the present system and a sincere attempt to meet the demands of the future.

By and large the report provides very well for individualized instruction and for a diversified curriculum. Vocational education is to be provided in the areas of typing stenography, shop work, home economics as well as agriculture. Moreover, the gifted as well as the slow learners are to be educated in accordance with their capacity. The required program for all would include four years of English, three or four years of social studies, a year of mathematics, and a year of science. When we compare this with proposed programs for the academically talented we notice a bias, however. There the one year of mathematics becomes four, and science is increased to three years whereas social studies remains three years with the possibility of an elective. As we have already pointed out, many of the problems that face the United States at home as well as abroad are not primarily technological. Why then should the social studies requirement for the academically talented be de-emphasized?

Possibly that question is best answered with a recommendation. All senior high schools should offer a required course dealing with the different culture areas of the world. Each year the problem regions could be stressed by studies or investigations in depth. All academically talented students should be required to take this course, but could be modified for other ability groups.

¹³ *Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, November, 1957 (Upper Midwest Section), p. 1.

¹⁴ *Minneapolis Star*, January 13, 1961; *New York Times*, December 28, 1960, p. 14.

¹⁵ Quoted in Ben M. Harris, "Education, Science and the New Religion," *Phi Delta Kappan*, March, 1959, p. 250 ff.

¹⁶ Report of *The University and World Affairs* by the Committee on the University and World Affairs, p. 14, (Ford Foundation, 1960).

also. Obviously, the instructor should be an excellent teacher and be especially well grounded in history and the social sciences. In 1959, the American Assembly published a report on Latin America based upon the thinking of outstanding statesmen, businessmen and scholars. In one of the final chapters the editor concludes:

There are no panaceas, no easy solutions, no dogmas, no formulas, no all-wise, omniscient conferences to settle the problems of . . . Latin America. . . . Humility might almost be the first requisite for the student, the diplomat or the man in the street. There are no "experts" on Latin America: there are only degrees of ignorance. . . . Perhaps the wisest progression would be thus: sympathy, knowledge, understanding, patience, patience, patience. . . .¹⁷

Is it any wonder that our foreign policy sometimes goes awry!

Students, Standards and New Procedures

In this period of change many new devices, novel procedures and experiments are being tried and evaluated. As yet and on a national scale these collectively might be characterized as experiments and confusion. One of the most interesting new techniques is team teaching, in which several teachers pool their abilities and take turns lecturing to sections in college style. This gives the teacher more free time in the off-days to concentrate on research and possibly to enrich the content of the instruction. On certain days of the week the large sections are split into small groups either for discussion of the lectures or for studies in depth. This procedure combines the enriched lecture and the seminar method at the secondary level. It should make the content of the course more meaningful to all and also appeal to the gifted or more talented pupil.

Another practice that warrants consideration is grouping students according to ability within subjects. Experiments have been conducted which indicate that such a procedure is more satisfactory than over-all grade-to-grade acceleration based on I.Q.

ratings. It is hoped that as a result of wise guidance and good teaching, with the aid of new devices, the curriculum and content can be so individualized that all learners, slow and gifted alike, can be motivated to work up to capacity.¹⁸

Furthermore, there is now a tendency to stress standards more than formerly. For example, various types of diplomas have been advocated: one indicating graduation with high honors, others indicating lesser degrees of achievement. It is gratifying to note in this respect that the new United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, has stressed "more quality and vigor in teaching and what is taught." He has also emphasized the importance of the social sciences, humanities and fine arts.¹⁹

Although many methods and devices can be used to dramatize and motivate teaching, it might be wise to stress that unbridled enthusiasm for such procedures might defeat our purpose and develop meaningless benchmark passivity. This serves to underline the importance of the next topic—teacher!

Teachers

At various times in the past and even at present society has experienced a shortage of teachers; there has always been a shortage of real teachers—qualified teachers! We have treated already the other factors involved in the education process: the school plant, the curriculum, the teaching procedures and methods. Obviously these are necessary and important, but the teacher is vital.

According to recent statistics, there are about 26,500 high schools in the United States in which more than 500,000 teachers hold sway. This is the largest single professional group in the United States. For approximately one-fifth of their lives most of the citizens must endure or enjoy more face-to-face contact with the members of the teaching profession than with any other. The impact of the schools for good or evil should be considerable. Most of these teachers are women, and the average age is rising despite the influx of new teachers. This indicates that more are career teachers than formerly, and that they should raise the prestige of the profession.²⁰

¹⁷ Herbert L. Mathews (Editor), *The United States and Latin America*, The American Assembly (Columbia University, 1959), p. 192.

¹⁸ Walter W. Cook, "The Gifted and the Retarded," *Phi Delta Kappan*, March, 1958; Charles R. Foster, *op. cit.*

¹⁹ *Minneapolis Star*, April 5, 1961, p. 13A.

²⁰ Paul Woodring, *Let's Talk Sense About Our Schools* (Mcraw-Hill, 1953), p. 88 ff. The increase in the average is undoubtedly due also to more married women who are teaching.

If teachers are to play a significant role in society, it is important that citizens be concerned with their qualifications and training. Woodring points out that the average intelligence of those engaged in teaching was distinctly higher in World War II than in World War I, and that their ratings compare favorably with lawyers, medical men and accountants.²¹

But even if teaching standards have improved there is no reason why they should not be raised still higher. High school teachers along with instructors in lower as well as the higher institutions, are *all* (educators and scholars alike) engaged in passing on the social heritage, which includes our social, political and spiritual values. This is a sacred trust indeed. A host of writers of all complexions from Rear Admiral Rickover and John Dewey to Thomas Jefferson have said that democracy cannot survive in an atmosphere of ignorance. The success then of our nation apparently rests upon enlightened public opinion. In other words, the decisions being considered in the areas of business, agriculture, foreign affairs, space and education must rest upon *informed* public interest. Walter Lippmann has said—"Public interest may be presumed to be what men would choose if they saw clearly, thought rationally, acted disinterestedly and benevolently."²² The task of the teacher is vital but also difficult.

Every stage or epoch of society tends to become *zeitgebunden* (time bound). In other words the "conventional wisdom" is often out-of-date or obsolete and yet is revered or sacred because of long usage as well as being highly propagandized. As a result, the "bland often lead the blind."²³ Other factors which tend to confound true liberal arts thinking are wealth, status in society, party politics, religion, race, as well as other differences. Whitehead has stated "Where attainable knowledge could have changed the issue, ignorance has the guilt of vice."²⁴ If one accepts this attitude and then considers the rather shocking scandals which have occurred recently within the United States in the areas of education, communica-

tion, government, and business, one is almost frightened by the task which faces the American teacher of today. It is high time that national leaders be concerned with the educational institutions charged with the transmission of our heritage, which includes democratic and spiritual values.

The training of qualified teachers is extremely vital, and we think it appropriate to introduce that topic with the following observation:

Let us eliminate the extremists of the liberal arts crowd—those who believe that a good liberal arts education, uncontaminated with methodology of any kind, is desirable for beginning high school teachers. They seem happiest flying backwards. Let us eliminate the opposite numbers from the educationists—those whose concern is to keep the present duplication of professional educational courses or who would prefer to have more rather than fewer.²⁵

Those remaining should stop arguing whether the pupil, teacher or method is most important. Good teachers must know something about all factors but a great deal about their subject matter and field, and "the best way to create interest in a subject is to render it worth knowing." For the benefit of the progressive or method side one cannot do this well without knowing most of the ramifications of a discipline. In order for teaching to be both an art and a science it is also necessary to know how to teach something at the proper level.

In all schools engaged in teacher training a History of Philosophy of Education course should be required. Some unsatisfactory attempts have been made to require such course. Often a watered down version is offered which adds up to almost nothing. This course should be taught by someone who has a knowledge of basic concepts of education and psychology but is steeped in philosophy and history. How, for example, could one teach the new educational trends of the Renaissance without understanding the historical forces that brought on this new era? In short, the person who teaches this course should be a great teacher. If it is necessary to secure such a man, he should be paid a high salary, higher than are paid in the fields of science, philosophy, or history—higher even than that of a winning coach.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

²² Quoted in Woodring, *A Fourth of a Nation*, p. 91.

²³ John Galbraith, *Affluent Society* (Houghton Mifflin, 1958), Chapter I.

²⁴ *University and World Affairs*, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

²⁵ Quoted in Chase and Anderson, *op. cit.*, p. 252.

It would be wrong to create the impression that money itself will solve the problems of education. In the past 30 years the salaries of secondary school teachers have increased considerably and still there is educational activity that might be characterized as "glorified baby sitting"—and sometimes not so glorified. Furthermore, the average salary of school administrators has improved markedly and many of these professional men are guilty of the extreme charges expressed in recent books, periodicals and the press. To some extent, this is also true of those who have the ultimate authority or responsibility for the quality of teachers coming from the teacher-training institutions. It should be the earnest hope of all that these "bad guys" are but the remnants of the evil past, and that a judicious combination of money, interest and intelligent effort can produce the same "success" in a liberal program of education that similar factors have produced in athletics.²⁶

Another very important suggestion for the teacher training program is to implement the present emphasis, termed the all-institutional approach. No department should assume an aloof or hostile attitude. It might be pertinent to point out that much of the difficulty in education today can be charged not so much to the past system, as to the subject matter traditionalists who have been indifferent to the business of teaching in which they themselves have been engaged. Wouldn't his situation make Socrates smile? Many of the subject matter critics revere the Greek philosopher, and from Socrates comes Socratic questioning, a very important method in "education." But apparently the impasse between the two sides in the Great Debate is being resolved, for according to *Phi Delta Kappan* a cooperative attitude developed at the Second Bowling Green Conference and many articles in educational magazines have pressed the all-institutional approach.²⁷

Many of the changes recommended by dominant for the improvement of the comprehensive high school will be only superficial unless they are accompanied by improved teacher training at the higher level—in liberal arts as well as teachers' colleges. There

are, of course, many other suggestions for reform of teacher education, including such items as adequate time for cadet teachers to do their practice-teaching, elimination of duplication in courses and better screening of candidates. Recently a high school principal told this writer, "I can solve the teacher shortage." "How?" he was asked. "By returning to the old normal school idea," of one year of teacher training. In his opinion, many superior students would enter teaching if they were not subjected to so many monotonous "education" courses.

He was leaning over backwards to make a point, but there is much truth in his contention. Many top ranking students who have been exposed to superior teaching in high school already know much about the unit, the project or the problem method. It is the height of stupidity to force upon them two special methods courses plus one in general methods. The same reasoning applies to practice teaching. The length of time spent in this activity has little relation to future success. Rather it is an indication of the low potential of past candidates. Some superior candidates need little time in the field and instead should be acquiring a background for world problems in Africa, Latin America or Asia—even if they plan to become scientists. Some candidates could of course profit by more time in practice teaching, whereas a very few are misfits and should never have started.

In short, the teacher training institution should produce candidates qualified intellectually, well versed in methods and sufficiently supplied with subject matter background to understand their fields with a professional attitude. Such a teacher should be courageous enough to attack controversial issues especially in the area of the social sciences. A teacher of such ability and training should not only be inspiring but also disturbing at times. And this is the very essence of liberal arts education. But there are obstacles in the way and one of the most important is the concept of *Zeitgebundenheit* (mentioned earlier).

Conclusions or Prospects

Immediately after Hiroshima this writer listened to an illustrated lecture on nuclear power delivered by a noted scientist. Ac-

²⁶ Leo J. Hertz, "More Money, More Learning?" *The New Republic*, March 6, 1961; William B. Furlong, "Those Ill-fated Barbarians," *ibid.*, March 13, 1961.

²⁷ December, 1958.

according to this authority, before World War II scientists thought it would take millions of years to achieve atomic or nuclear power. But who knew then that the government would contribute billions, create an Oak Ridge Project, and do the job in several years? Probably the same concentration of money, brains and effort might accomplish similar results if only there were an Oak Ridge for education and peace!

Because of the notoriety of Little Rock, it is easy to see how *Zeitgebundenheit* is a factor in the South. To what extent is this always a factor and to what extent does it make world cooperation difficult if not impossible? This poses a question which Conant must consider when he suggests changes for the comprehensive high school and teacher training. What is needed for the United States and the world is a neo-progressivism.

Change Is Needed

Possibly this thought should be considered in connection with the present federal-aid-to-education bill.²⁸ It would appear that change is absolutely necessary in this field, as it was in the area of police protection. The horse and buggy constable would not suffice in this age of powerful automobiles and airplanes. In like manner a horse and buggy education cannot possibly meet the demands of the modern space age. Despite the many critical books, conferences and reports, confusion, lack of uniformity, and inequality of educational opportunity exist, and some over-all planning by the federal government seems to be the answer. To contend otherwise and expect success would be like entering a race against jet planes with the original Kitty Hawk airplane. Possibly it might be wiser for the President of the United States to charge the Commissioner of Education, the officers of the N.E.A., and the American Council on Education with the responsibility for an over-all plan to implement a federal-aid-to-education bill. They should also convoke a conference to give expression to a national philosophy of educa-

tion which could be utilized by the states and local units.

As I prepared this manuscript I could hear from a kitchen radio the countdown on the flight "Freedom 7," the United States space capsule. Naturally, I dropped my work until the dramatic finish came. From high above Florida I caught the relayed phrase "What a beautiful view!" Apparently the first United States astronaut had vision all the way to Cape Hatteras. Presumably if he had looked south he could have seen Cuba, "Pearl of the Antilles," Haiti, the Dominican Republic, possibly Venezuela, and even Panama. This too could present "a beautiful view"—palm tree wafted by gentle trade winds in the lands of *por la mañana*. Beneath the surface, however, is a bite-the-fingernails misery (in countries of great potential wealth), and most competent authorities agree that revolution in these areas have been long overdue.

It might be pertinent to ask: How qualified are adults, students and prospective teachers to evaluate comment by a competent authority relative to Cuba? "To what marked degree the Cuban crisis reveals moral failure of the West. . . ."²⁹ And to what extent can Americans make wise choices regarding other troubled areas where such choices are confounded by various pressures of interest which might be characterized as parochial or the product of a pocketbook philosophy? If liberal arts education can be defined as using the wisdom of ages to understand one's self in relation to the other, the history of the past proves it has been and presumably will be progressive.

Possibly a neo-progressive education philosophy, at least world-wide in scope, might help us cultivate our little garden. This should suffice until we are disturbed by news of people staking out private claims on parts of the moon.

To gain an integrated individual, each of us needs to cultivate his own garden. But there is no fence about this garden; it is no sharply marked enclosure. Our garden is the world, in the angle at which it touches our own manner of being. By accepting the corporate and industrial world in which we live and by thus fulfilling the precondition for interaction with it we, who are also parts of the moving present, create ourselves as we create an unknown future.³⁰

²⁸ J. T. McCaskill, "We Need Federal Support Not Federal Aid," *Phi Delta Kappan*, March, 1959.

²⁹ Irving P. Pfau, "A Note on Cuba," *American Universities Field Staff* (Reports Service), September, 1960. See also *Manchester Guardian*, (Air Edition), April 20, 1961, p. 1; April 27, 1961, p. 8.

³⁰ John Dewey, *Individualism Old and New* (Winton, Balch and Company, New York, 1930), p. 171.

Current Documents

ADMINISTRATION MEMORANDUM ON FEDERAL AID TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS

On March 28, 1961, a legal memorandum on the constitutionality of federal aid to sectarian schools was sent to the Congress by Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Abraham A. Ribicoff. The memorandum, prepared by the legal staff under Ribicoff in cooperation with the attorneys of the Department of Justice, supported President Kennedy's position against aid to private schools. Portions of the section discussing legislative proposals are reprinted here:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS AND PROPOSALS

This section considers legislative proposals which have been introduced or which may possibly be seriously urged.

A. General educational grants to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

Federal grants to sectarian schools for general educational purposes would run into the prohibitions of the First Amendment as interpreted in [Supreme Court decisions] * * * grants for assistance in the construction of general school facilities and for increasing teachers' salaries, to be administered by governmental agencies and made available directly to sectarian schools, are the clear use of what is proscribed by the Constitution. * * *

Since the Supreme Court has spoken, the only serious argument put forward against its conclusion rests more on considerations of fairness than of law. The argument is that, because sectarian schools meet all prescribed standards of education and because they contribute significantly to the education of American children, they should be entitled to governmental assistance. This argument is bolstered by stating that, in effect, a refusal to grant assistance to children attending such schools constitutes a discrimination against them compatible with the spirit of the Fifth Amendment, and, viewed realistically, violates the mandate of the First Amendment against prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

The difficulty with this viewpoint, apart from the fact that it has been consistently rejected by the courts, lies in the fact that

students attending such schools do so as a matter of free choice. If the choice is not "free" it is because of the religious beliefs of the individuals making the choice, not because of governmental edict. Since the public schools are open to all children without exception, it cannot be argued that constitutionally proscribed discrimination exists.

The prohibition embodied in the free exercise provision of the First Amendment is only a prohibition against government action which interferes with religious freedom. The Constitution does not require the government to create conditions which make the free exercise of religion less burdensome financially.

B. General educational loans to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

It has been suggested that even if grants to sectarian elementary and secondary schools are unconstitutional, long-term low-interest loans would not be. While we believe that loans constitute a less substantial assistance to religion than outright grants, we are persuaded by the decisions of the Supreme Court that this proposal is no less a form of support than grants and is equally prohibited by the Constitution. * * *

Low-interest, across-the-board construction loans do provide measurable economic benefit to religious institutions. Moreover, there is a total failure in this proposal to distinguish between those aspects of a school which are involved with the religious teaching and those which may not be. This combination of factors when applied to elementary and secondary schools places the proposal beyond the limits of permissible assistance.

C. Special purpose programs.

The federal government at present engages in a wide variety of statutory programs that have some impact on sectarian educational institutions. It is significant that the great bulk of government-supported programs is in fields of higher education. Examples are aids for specialized training; or research connected with national defense, public health, or improving educational methods; or loans for college housing facilities or to permit needy students to attend college. In all such programs no direct connection with religion is present, and the funds in each case appear adequately separated from any religious function to stay within constitutional bounds.

Existing federal programs at the elementary and secondary level are less extensive in number and size. Typically, such programs either bear a clear-cut relationship to children's health or promote a special purpose with a clear national defense implication. These programs are devoid of any substantial aid to the religious function, and such aid as might possibly occur is both remote and unavoidable.

To what extent a special purpose provides constitutional legitimacy to assistance to elementary or secondary schools depends on the extent to which the specific objectives being advanced are unrelated to the religious aspects of sectarian education. The problem is complicated because assistance for one purpose may free funds which would otherwise be devoted to it for use to support the religious function and thus, in effect, indirectly yet substantially support religion in violation of the establishment clause. At the present time, the National Defense Education Act permits the United States Commissioner of Education to make loans to private schools to acquire science, mathematics, or foreign language equipment. We believe such loans are constitutional because the connection between loans for such purposes and religious functions of a sectarian school seems to be nonexistent or minimal. Furthermore, the money is loaned at one-fourth of one per cent above the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States, thus avoiding characterization as more than a grant of credit.

In considering whether an existing governmental program or a given proposal for new governmental action exceeds constitutional limits of assistance to a religious institution, no single criterion is necessarily decisive.

The constitutional principles involved are obviously the same whether the subject is elementary and secondary school education or higher education, but the factual circumstances surrounding the application of the principles are dramatically different. The reasons are largely historical.

The history of education in the United States at the grammar and high school level is largely one of free public schools. * * *

The history of college and university education is almost precisely the opposite. While from a relatively early date the federal and some state governments subsidized state universities and colleges, the bulk of advanced education has until recently been carried on by private institutions, the majority of which have a religious origin.

Primary schooling has long been accepted as essential for every American child, and secondary education is rapidly becoming recognized as almost equally a necessity. Attendance at a university or college, on the other hand, has always been a matter of individual decision, dictated or influenced by the circumstances and preferences of the individual child and his family. Even today fewer than half of the high school graduates enter college on a fulltime basis, and of these 41 per cent are students in non-public institutions. * * *

There are thus important differences between school and college, not only in terms of history and tradition but also in terms of the compulsory nature of attendance. There are differences, too, from the standpoint of the national interest involved. At the college and graduate levels the public institutions alone could not begin to cope with the number of young men and women already pursuing higher education, and expansion of these institutions or the creation of new ones sufficient to meet the expected increase of enrollment is out of the question. The effort which it is agreed must now be made in the field of higher education would, confined to public institutions, force an even more intensive selection of students and even

(Continued on p. 53)

Received At Our Desk

n Education . . .

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE SCHOOL. BY LAWRENCE A. CREMIN. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961. 387 pages and index, \$5.50.)

In this book the author traces in detail the history of progressive education from its late-nineteenth century beginnings to its mid-twentieth century demise. Cremin points out that it is interesting to note that in a little over half a century the American public's attitude toward education has "... come full circle from the early progressives." The progressive education movement, according to Cremin's thesis, grew out of the general protest and reform movement which followed the Civil War.

Born in a whirlwind of publicity created by critics suggesting that the schools be managed by professional educators "... according to scientific principles," progressive education received its fatal blow from the cyclone created by critics on the other end of the spectrum of public opinion who demanded that "... to undo the damage of the professionals," the schools should be returned to the care of the professors of arts and sciences who would restore "intellectual integrity."

The author, Lawrence A. Cremin, who is Chairman of the Department of Social and Philosophical Foundation of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, brings an altogether delightful felicity of expression as well as an impressive breadth of scholarship to the writing of the history of education. In his characteristically concise yet readable style, he blends the skills of the historian, social scientist, and educator to present the history of one of American education's most interesting eras in the natural and significant context of the nation's over-all intellectual and social history.

HARRY V. BARNARD
Rutgers University

EXCELLENCE. BY JOHN W. GARDNER. (New York: Harper & Bros., 1961. 171 pages, notes and index, \$3.95.)

"Can we be equal and excellent too?"—the subtitle of this book—provides the frame of reference for this analysis of the defects of American education.

John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Foundation, discusses the conflicts for American education: the traditional emphasis on individual performance, i.e., let the best man win, and an "equalitarianism wrongly conceived—which ignores differences in native capacity and achievement. . . ."

Exploring the problem of fostering individual talents in an atmosphere where every child is expected to be equal, the author offers a definition of excellence, to embrace all "the richly varied potentialities of mankind." "We must foster a conception of excellence which may be applied to every degree of ability and to every socially acceptable activity."

Americans who have not grown "soft" will be delighted with this spirited appeal to keep our society dynamic and highly motivated.

T.H.B.

TAXES FOR THE SCHOOLS. Volume two in the series, **FINANCING THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.** BY ROGER A. FREEMAN. (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Social Science Research, 1960. 441 pages, appendix and tables, \$5.00.)

This volume is the continuation of a study on *School Needs in the Decade Ahead*, completed in 1958, and estimating that school revenue needs will double in the period between 1958 and 1970. Is it true that "there is nothing wrong with the schools that money won't cure?" False, says the author, who thinks that it would be possible to get "More Education for the Money" in the United States. Nonetheless, more money will obviously be needed.

After a detailed and careful analysis of

the various possibilities of raising additional revenue, Roger Freeman suggests that the basic question is "Which level of government will assume the onerous task of imposing the necessary tax increases?" Believing that the state and local governments are able to finance schools without federal aid, Freeman contends that "The fiscal case for Federal school aid is contrived, unsubstantiated and fallacious." The sections on federal aid are particularly timely. The author outlines the story of the fight for federal aid that began shortly

after the War between the States. Type of aid proposals are analyzed. The four major arguments favoring federal school aid are listed and the four major arguments against federal school aid are also summarized. "The ideological case for Federal aid which calls for national standards and national and professional direction of educational policy has found little echo in Congress or among the great majority of Americans. . . ."

This is a well written argument against federal school financing. T.H.J.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION: A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

By HARRY V. BARNARD

Rutgers University

- Allen, Hollis P., *THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION*. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950.
- Anderson, William, *THE NATION AND THE STATE, RIVALS OR PARTNERS?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955.
- Axt, Richard G., *THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION*. N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Buehler, Ezra C. (Compiler), *FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION*. N.Y.: Noble and Noble, Inc., 1934.
- Burke, Arvid J., *FINANCING PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES*. N.Y.: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Educational Policies Commission, *FEDERAL ACTIVITIES IN EDUCATION*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1939.
- Educational Policies Commission and Problems and Policies Commission, *SOURCE BOOK ON FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS IN EDUCATION*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Council on Education, 1945.
- Edwards, Newton, *EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH; A NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1939.
- Freeman, Roger A., *FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION, BOON OR BANE?* Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Association, 1955.
- Hales, Dawson W., *FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION, A CRITICAL APPRAISAL*. N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954.
- Hall, Thomas H. (Compiler), *CURRENT CONFLICTING VIEWS ON FEDERAL GRANTS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION*. Chicago: National Research Bureau, 1934.
- Johnson, Julia E. (Compiler), *FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION (The Reference Shelf, Vol. 9, No. 3)*. N.Y.: The H. W. Wilson Co., 1933.
- , *FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION (The Reference Shelf, Vol. 14, No. 10)*. N.Y.: The H. W. Wilson Co., 1941.
- Keith, J. A. H., and Bagley, W. C., *THE NATION AND THE SCHOOLS*. N.Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1920.
- Kennedy, John F., *MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES RELATIVE TO AMERICAN EDUCATION*. (House Document No. 92, 87th Congress, 1st Session.) Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.
- Knight, Douglas M., et al, *THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Lee, Gordon C., *THE STRUGGLE FOR FEDERAL AID: FIRST PHASE*. N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949.
- Legislative Reference Service, *Library of Congress BENEFICIAL EFFECTS OF FEDERAL AID TO THE STATES FOR EDUCATION*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951.
- , *FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND EDUCATIONAL ISSUES BEFORE CONGRESS*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951.
- , *MAJOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILLS: A CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY AND DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED MAJOR BILLS, 1949-59, AND BIBLIOGRAPHY*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.
- Miller, Helen A. (Compiler), *FEDERAL FUNDS FOR EDUCATION*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951.

- FOR EDUCATION: A HISTORY OF PROPOSALS WHICH HAVE RECEIVED CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES (1789-1960). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961.
- Forse, Wayne, *et al*, CONSTITUTIONALITY OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION IN ITS VARIOUS ASPECTS. (Senate Doc. No. 29, 87th Cong., 1st Sess.) Wash., D.C.: Gov't. Printing Office, 1961.
- Port, Paul R., FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION. N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1936.
- uller, Helen M. (Compiler), FEDERAL AID FOR THE EQUALIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY (*The Reference Shelf*, Vol. 9, No. 8). N.Y.: The H. W. Wilson Co., 1934.
- ational Advisory Committee on Education, FEDERAL RELATIONS IN EDUCATION. Washington, D.C.: National Capital Press, Inc., 1931.
- attlebaum, Charles A., FEDERAL AID TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1948.
- , FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954.
- , FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL POLICIES, PROGRAMS AND PROPOSALS: PART I, BACKGROUND; ISSUES; RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.
- , FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIP AND FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AIDS TO STUDENTS. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1950.
- nkin, Edgar R. (Compiler), FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION: DEBATE HANDBOOK. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1934.
- , FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION: DEBATE HANDBOOK. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.
- Russell, James E., FEDERAL ACTIVITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR. N.Y.: King's Crown Press, 1951.
- , (Editor), NATIONAL POLICIES FOR EDUCATION, HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES. N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1955.
- Seidner, F. J., FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION: THE SITUATION TODAY. Washington, D.C.: The Public Affairs Institute, 1959.
- Study Committee on Federal Responsibility in the Field of Education, FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1955.
- Swift, Fletcher H., FEDERAL AND STATE POLICIES IN PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE IN THE UNITED STATES. N.Y.: Ginn and Co., 1931.
- Task Force Committee on Education, REPORT ON EDUCATION. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961.
- Taylor, Howard C., THE EDUCATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EARLY LAND ORDINANCES. N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1922.
- Todd, Lewis P., WARTIME RELATIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1917-1918. N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1945.
- Zeitlin, Harry, FEDERAL RELATIONS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION, 1933-1943. N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958.
- Zook, George F., ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945.

(Continued from p. 50)

more concentrated effort to guide them into fields of study deemed important to the national defense and welfare. It would likely induce these institutions to overemphasize particular fields of study to the detriment of a balanced curriculum. Such warping of educational policies is not to be contemplated lightly, and, to the extent that Congress finds it appropriate to encourage expansion of our university and college facilities, Congress must be free to build upon what we have, the private as well as the public institutions.

All these considerations indicate that aid to higher education is less likely to encounter constitutional difficulty than aid to primary and secondary schools. The same considera-

tions apply even more forcefully to graduate and specialized education.

The Administration bill to assist higher education authorizes loans to institutions, without distinguishing between public and private ones or between those under secular and sectarian sponsorship. It also provides for college scholarships awarded on a competitive basis. These scholarships may be used at any accredited college which the recipient selects. In addition, the bill provides for the payment to the college of a "cost of education" allowance to supplement the scholarship. * * *

We conclude that the Administration's proposals for higher education are within constitutional limits.

The Month in Review

INTERNATIONAL

African Conference

May 8—Leaders of independent African nations meet at Monrovia to discuss Africa's future.

May 27—45 trade union organizations meet in the first all-African trade union conference.

Disarmament

May 5—U.S. President John Kennedy returns Arthur H. Dean to Geneva test ban treaty talks, noting that he has asked for a report from Dean "within a reasonable time on the prospects for a constructive outcome."

May 6—Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev says that "in a short time" disarmament negotiations between Russia and the U.S. will begin.

May 15—Russia warns she will resume testing if France does not stop nuclear testing.

May 25—Arthur Dean returns to Geneva after a second visit to the U.S., saying that the U.S. plans to make "every reasonable effort" to reach an agreement with the U.S.S.R. and Britain.

May 29—The U.S. and Britain submit a plan to vary the number of annual inspections in the U.S.S.R. from 12 to 20.

Geneva Conference on Laos (See *Laos*.)

North Atlantic Treaty Organization

May 7—60 scientists and scholars from 15 nations asks for a treaty to stop the spread of nuclear arms, after a 5-day meeting at Oslo before the Nato meetings open.

May 8—The U.S. promises to resist Russian infringement of the rights of West Berlin.

May 10—The Nato Council challenges the "ever-increasing area" of Communist pressure all over the world, in a communiqué at the close of the annual spring meeting.

United Nations

May 15—The U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America ends its ninth assembly, calling for vigorous measures for economic development and greater integration of Latin American economies.

May 26—Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld says that the Congo Republic needs "immediate outside support" bolster its financial situation. (See also *Congo*.)

West European Economy

May 16—U.S. President Kennedy talks with Walter R. Hallstein, head of the Common Market, on problems created by the trade alignment; Kennedy strongly supports the Common Market in a joint statement.

Finland ratifies 3 laws providing for association with the European Free Trade Association.

May 18—Hallstein announces another 10 per cent cut by the Common Market in internal tariff barriers. The total tariff reduction since 1959 is 50 per cent.

BELGIUM

May 5—The new Cabinet of Premier Theodor Lefevre receives a vote of confidence in the lower house of parliament.

BOLIVIA

May 14—The U.S. announces that the U.S. will lend some \$50 million to Bolivia for industrial and social programs. The U.S. will provide \$10 million of that amount.

BRAZIL

May 17—The U.S. and the International Monetary Fund announce a loan of \$40 million to Brazil, facing a balance of payments deficit.

May 28—In a report made by Brazilian Special Ambassador João Dantas, just returned from a tour of East Europe, it disclosed that he has signed trade agreements with East Europe for \$1.655 billion.

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH, THE Canada

May 2—It is announced in Ottawa that Canada and Communist China have negotiated a grain sale agreement.

May 16—U.S. President and Mrs. Kennedy arrive in Ottawa for a 2-day official visit. (See also *U.S.*, *Foreign Policy*.)

May 25—Prime Minister John Diefenbaker says that if Canada recognizes Communist China this would be regarded as Canadian "approval" of the Communist regime.

May 26—Israeli Premier David Ben-Gurion and Diefenbaker end 2 days of talks; a joint communiqué states that they have agreed that "an eventual solution to Middle East tensions must envisage the right of all nations in the area to live in peace and security."

Ceylon

May 5—The House of Representatives passes a bill establishing a state corporation to import and distribute petroleum products.

May 6—It is announced in Colombo that 2,124 guns have been turned in on government order in the Tamil areas.

May 12—Two Buddhist monks and a business man are sentenced to death for the murder of the late Prime Minister S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike.

Ghana

May 1—President Kwame Nkrumah takes personal charge of the government and its dominant party as general secretary.

May 5—Poland and Ghana sign a general trade agreement.

May 12—The Foreign Ministry issues a statement declaring that Ghana has never denied receiving arms from the Soviet Union.

May 13—A Government White Paper suggests that polygamy should not be grounds for divorce.

May 28—The government reveals plans to retain the academic staff at the University College of Ghana but may cancel some appointments when the college achieves university status in the fall. Originally the government notified the faculty that all contracts were cancelled.

Great Britain (See also Laos.)

May 3—A former British vice consul receives a 42-year prison sentence for espionage for the U.S.S.R.; he pleaded guilty to the charges.

May 5—Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip are received in private audience by Pope John XXIII.

May 15—Lord of Appeal Radcliffe is named by Prime Minister Harold Macmillan to head the government's inquiry into the nation's security system.

May 19—Britain and Russia sign a 5-year pact on collaboration in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

May 31—William David Ormsby-Gore is appointed to succeed Sir Harold Caccia as the British ambassador to the U.S. Ormsby-Gore was minister of state for foreign affairs.

India

May 3—United States Ambassador at Large W. Averell Harriman arrives in New Delhi to talk to Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru about Laos.

May 9—Parliament in joint session unanimously approves a law to prohibit giving and accepting dowries, a traditional Hindu custom.

Pakistan

May 21—Afghan forces in the region of the Khyber Pass are attacked by Pakistan Air Force planes, after 2 days of conflict on the border.

May 22—A draft constitution for Pakistan is received by President Mohammad Ayub Khan. He asks a special Cabinet meeting to appoint a subcommittee to study the draft.

May 23—President Ayub declares that Russian arms are being utilized by Afghanistan.

May 28—In Washington, diplomatic sources reveal that U.S.S.R. reconnaissance planes are studying the northern borders of Pakistan and Kashmir.

Union of South Africa

May 3—The United Arab Republic severs diplomatic ties with South Africa because of the *apartheid* policy of the Union.

May 18—Charles Robberts Swart is elected president of the new South African Republic, independent of the Commonwealth as of May 31.

In a 24 hour period, more than 600 Africans are arrested.

May 19—The government bans meetings until June 26 except for church services, theatre and authorized gatherings.

May 20—The government calls 2,000 reservists to active full-time duty.

May 23—Prime Minister Hendrik F. Verwoerd refuses an Opposition request for Parliament debate on mass arrests and troop mobilization.

May 31—The Union of South Africa be-

comes a republic; it ends its British Commonwealth ties.

BRITISH EMPIRE, THE

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland

May 5—Prime Minister Sir Roy Welensky charges that South African racism contains "the seeds of bitter trouble for the Western nations in the time to come."

May 15—Southern Rhodesian constitutional conferences open.

Kenya

May 5—The Colonial Office agrees to increase British aid to Kenya to a total of £14.5 million (\$40.6 million).

May 7—200 white Kenyans vote to send a protest delegation to London to ask for more adequate police protection following the murder of a white housewife.

May 11—The new Legislative Council opens; thousands of Africans protest.

May 25—Hugh Fraser, Parliamentary Under Secretary for the Colonies, says that there has been no change in the Government's policy of bringing Kenya gradually to final independence.

Nigeria

May 5—The Northern People's Congress wins elections for an enlarged House of Assembly, allowing Premier Sir Ahmadu Bello to return without opposition. The party now holds 156 of 170 seats.

May 17—Nigeria reveals plans to void the ban on French aircraft and shipping, a protest against French nuclear tests in the Sahara. The ban will be raised May 18.

West Indies Federation

May 31—A Constitutional Conference opens in London; the day of independence for the Federation is expected to be set. Sharp differences exist among the delegates as to the strength required for the new federal government.

CHINA, NATIONALIST

May 15—A joint communiqué issued by U.S. Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson and President Chiang Kai-shek. The communiqué reiterates U.S. support of the nationalist government and refusal to extend recognition to Red China.

CHINA, THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF (Communist)

May 13—Reports of drought, flood and other natural calamities plaguing Red Chinese agriculture are disclosed.

CONGO, REPUBLIC OF THE (Leopoldville)

May 2—Katanga's Cabinet declares that it is willing to discuss U.N. demands to oust foreign advisers and reorganize the Katanga army (this province has a mercenary white foreign legion and Belgian civil servants).

May 7—President Joseph Kasavubu's central government announces that it will try Tshombe for "high treason."

May 10—19 aides, detained with Tshombe in Coquilhatville, are charged with treason.

May 16—Antoine Gizenga, leader of Eastern Province, in a radio broadcast made public today, calls Kasavubu's decision to reconvene parliament "illegal." He demands that Parliament meet at Kamin (a U.N. base) instead of Leopoldville.

May 23—In a note to Security Council President Daniel Schweitzer of Chile, the Soviet Union endorses Gizenga's plan for a new parliament meeting in Kamina.

May 25—U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld announces that Rajeshwar Dayal has resigned as special representative in the Congo. It is reported that Kasavubu and other Congolese leaders meeting at Coquilhatville last night agree to substitute a unicameral legislature for the Congo's present system of 2 houses. It is also reported that the conference has adopted a plan whereby 20 new states will replace the Congo's 6 provinces.

May 29—President Moïse Tshombe is transferred from his detention at Coquilhatville to a villa in a military camp at Leopoldville.

May 31—The Congo government publishes a transition program to carry out the decision of the Coquilhatville conference, which it was decided to set up a federal republic of 20 states, with a unicameral legislature and president. The conference broke up 3 days ago.

CUBA

May 1—Fidel Castro tells May Day crowd that there will be no more elections; the regime will rely on popular demonstration for support. He also declares that foreign priests will be made to leave and that Catholic and other private schools will be nationalized. He declares that Cuba is a "socialist state."

May 3—Captain Manuel Artime, a leader of the April 17 rebel landing, and 21 followers were captured in Zapata swamp yesterday, it is disclosed.

May 6—It is reported that yesterday Dr. Roldolfo Nodal Tarafa, leader of the newly organized 17th of April movement, told of his imprisonment for 11 weeks with 16 others. Nodal declared that the 17, who were in training for the Cuban invasion at a Guatemala base, were held by the C.I.A. because they objected to working with pro-Batista Cubans.

May 17—Premier Castro declares that he will exchange Cuban rebel prisoners taken in April for 500 U.S. bulldozers.

May 22—After talks with a group of 10 rebel prisoners paroled on May 20, U.A.W. President Walter Reuther announces that the U.S. will trade tractors for prisoners. A Tractors for Freedom Committee, with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as honorary chairman, is formed.

May 23—It is reported that the Peoples' Revolutionary Movement, the Cuban underground group, decided to end relations with the Cuban Revolutionary Council, at a meeting in Miami last night. The P.R.M., headed by Manuel Ray, charges the Council is still strongly under U.S. (particularly C.I.A.) influence, and that it works with supporters of former President Batista.

May 27—The Revolutionary Movement of the People announces that it formally has ended cooperation with the Council.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, THE

May 31—The death of Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo is announced. It is reported that the Dominican dictator, in power since 1930, was assassinated the night of May 30, by a group led by General Juan Tomas Diaz.

FRANCE

May 18—Jean Foyer is appointed minister of cooperation to handle relations between France and the newly independent states of French Africa.

500,000 gas, electricity and public transportation workers (on buses and trains) strike for higher wages.

May 19—President Charles de Gaulle decrees the requisition of workers to prevent further walkouts. The requisition order

enables ministers to enjoin workers to remain on their jobs; defiance of the requisitions is punishable by fines or prison terms.

May 24—King Baudouin and Queen Fabiola of Belgium are greeted by President de Gaulle on their arrival in Paris for a 3-day state visit.

May 29—The sedition trial of Generals Maurice Challe and André Zeller, 2 of the 4 generals heading the Algerian insurrection in April, begins.

May 31—President and Mrs. John F. Kennedy arrive in Paris. White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger and French Foreign Ministry spokesman Pierre Baraduc declare that Kennedy and de Gaulle have reached agreement on the handling of the Berlin situation.

Generals Challe and Zeller are sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment for their role in the Algerian insurrection.

FRANCE OVERSEAS

Algeria

May 6—General André Zeller, one of the 4 leaders of the April 22 uprising, surrenders. Generals Raoul Salan and Edmond Jouhaud, the other principals, are still missing.

May 8—President de Gaulle, in a television address, urges the Algerian rebels and the French people to cooperate in building self-government for Algeria. De Gaulle states that if agreement with Algerian rebel leaders is not reached, France will by itself give Algeria independence.

May 17—The Algerian Provisional Government in exile names Foreign Minister and Vice Premier Belkacem Krim to head an 8-man delegation for the peace talks at Evian-les-Bains.

May 20—It is reported that last night in Algiers and Oran waves of explosions were touched off by French right-wing extremists. The peace talks open today in Evian.

At Evian France declares a unilateral ceasefire in Algeria for 30 days; French troops will be limited to acts of defense or pursuit of active terrorists. Imprisoned deputy premier of the Algerian rebel government, Ahmed Ben Bella, with 4 others, is transferred to "controlled residence." The French offer technical and

financial aid for Algeria's development.

May 21—French and rebel fighting on the Moroccan-Algerian border continues. Tunisian and Moroccan border areas were exempted from the cease-fire declared yesterday by the French.

May 23—Krim declares that his provisional government will not accept a partitioning of Algeria.

It is disclosed that yesterday 10 French soldiers were killed when ambushed by Algerian rebels 60 miles outside of Algiers.

May 26—Louis Joxe, leader of the French delegation to Evian, declares that citizens of an independent Algeria could also retain French citizenship if desired.

FRENCH COMMUNITY, THE Senegal

May 13—The U.S. and Senegal sign an aid pact; the U.S. will loan \$3.5 million to Senegal.

GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF (West)

May 6—West Germany and Morocco sign an agreement whereby Morocco will receive German technical and economic aid.

May 24—The West German government tells the Soviet Union that the renewal of a cultural exchange pact between the two countries must include West Berlin.

The Western European Union announces that in amendments to the Brussels treaty limiting European arms build-up, it has authorized West Germany to build 8 destroyers weighing 6,000 tons apiece. They will be equipped with guided missiles.

May 25—The states of West Germany jointly declare unconstitutional the Ludendorff Movement, an anti-Semitic group.

HAITI

May 5—It is announced that Francois Duvalier has been elected to a second term of office. Duvalier also has 2 more years of his first 6-year term remaining. The election was last Sunday.

May 9—It is reported that Duvalier, in the unopposed contest, received 1,320,748 votes.

HONDURAS

May 12—The International Development Association, an independent affiliate of

the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (with easier credit terms), awards its first loan to Honduras for \$9 million.

IRAN

May 5—Premier Jafar Sharif-Imami and his Cabinet resign. Shah Mohammed Riza Pahlevi names Ali Amini as the new premier. The Sharif-Imami government collapses after demonstrations in front of the parliament where 30,000 students and teachers, demanding higher teaching salaries, insisted on the ex-Premier's resignation.

May 9—The Shah dissolves parliament. Amini will rule by decree until new elections are held.

May 11—It is announced that teachers' demands have been met and that teachers now will return to work.

May 13—It is reported that 5 Iranian generals have been arrested for corruption.

May 22—Twenty Iranian landowners yield to Amini's demands; they will sell their estates to the government, which will distribute the lands to the peasants.

ISRAEL

May 2—The Israeli court hearing the trial of Adolf Eichmann, head of the Nazi German Gestapo in charge of Jewish extermination, rules that testimony given by survivors of concentration camps is valid even though Eichmann's name is not mentioned. The Court further rules that it cannot prevent the arrests of ex-Nazis who come to Israel to testify in Eichmann's behalf. The Court had been asked to order immunity for 4 ex-Nazis who could testify for Eichmann.

May 14—It is reported that West Germany will hear 4 former Nazis in German courts.

May 24—Premier David Ben-Gurion arrives in Canada for talks with Prime Minister John Diefenbaker. (See also *British Commonwealth, Canada*.)

JORDAN

May 25—King Hussein weds Antoinette Avril Gardiner, a Britisher of common descent. She will have no title or royal position.

KOREA, SOUTH

May 16—The South Korean army sei-

control of the government and sets up a ruling military junta (anti-Communist and pro-U.S.). President Posun Yun is placed under house arrest. The junta is under the leadership of Army Chief of Staff Lieutenant General Do Young Chang. Martial law is proclaimed. The rebels report that they are in command of all major South Korean cities:

The U.S. Embassy in Seoul issues a statement supporting the U.N. Command under General Magruder, who has endorsed the government of Premier John M. Chang.

May 17—General Chang declares that his junta is in complete command. He promises to end corruption and rebuild Korea.

May 19—President Yun resigns.

Premier Chang, out of hiding, announces to newsmen at the capital the resignation of his Cabinet.

The membership of the 6-man junta is increased to 30.

May 20—Yun withdraws his resignation from the presidency. The junta announces a new Cabinet composed primarily of army officers.

May 21—A 14-man Cabinet, headed by General Chang, is sworn in.

May 22—All political parties (14) are dissolved; some 200 labor, farmers and fishermen's groups are also banned.

May 24—General Chang announces that he plans to visit the U.S. for talks with U.S. President Kennedy as soon as possible.

The U.S. declares that Kennedy's busy schedule cannot accommodate a visit by Chang.

May 26—The U.N. Command and the South Korean junta reach agreement. In a statement released by both sides, it is disclosed that Magruder has relinquished control over 2 reserve divisions, the First Airborne Combat Team and 5 additional military police companies. Magruder's operational control over South Korean troops under the U.N. Command is limited to defending South Korea from Communist attack.

May 28—The new government of South Korea declares 834 newspapers and news agencies illegal and orders the arrest of some 30 businessmen, officers and government officials.

LAOS

May 2—The Royal Lao government announces that a cease-fire has been arranged with rebel Pathet Lao forces in the area of Vang Vieng and Ban Van Ky.

May 3—The North Vietnamese radio broadcasts a cease-fire order to Pathet Lao rebels in Laos, effective this morning. The broadcast also issues an appeal to the Laotian government of Prince Boun Oum to negotiate a truce to be followed by peace talks. It is revealed that the neutralist Prince Souvanna Phouma, who is supported by Pathet Lao, has called a political conference 2 days from now.

May 5—Royal Laotian military delegates meet with Pathet Lao to negotiate a cease-fire at Hin Heup. The conference is termed "preliminary."

May 8—The International Control Commission for Laos (composed of Canada, Poland and India) arrives in Laos. Part of the group goes to Vientiane and part to Xiengkhouang, capital of the Communist held area. The commission has the task of supervising the cease-fire.

May 12—The opening of the Geneva conference is delayed because of the Soviet demand that the pro-Communist Pathet Lao be seated with status equal to that of the delegations representing Prince Boun Oum (pro-West) and Souvanna Phouma (neutralist). U.S. Secretary of State rejects the Soviet proposal. Britain's Lord Home and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko accept the report of the I.C.C. confirming a cease-fire in Laos.

May 13—Gromyko meets with Rusk; he is adamant on seating the Pathet Lao rebels with equal status.

Agreement between the pro-Western, neutralist and Pathet Lao factions on political and military talks to end the Laotian civil war is reached. The talks will begin tomorrow at Namone in territory held by neutralists and Pathet Lao.

May 14—Talks open in Namone between rebels and government authorities.

May 15—The U.S. agrees to a Soviet-British compromise whereby each nation at the Geneva talks will nominate whichever of the 3 Laotian delegations it desires. In this way, the rival delegations will be seated as individuals.

May 16—The 14-nation meeting on Laos

opens. Thailand and South Vietnam are absent. The Royal Lao delegation, representing Boun Oum, refuses to seat itself with rival factions.

May 17—In Laos, neutrals, royalists and Pathet Lao agree to discuss a coalition government for Laos and the creation of a mixed committee to work with the I.C.C. in supervising the cease-fire.

In Geneva, the U.S.S.R. presents its proposals for a veto over the I.C.C. and for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Laos.

May 21—Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia suggests that the 3 princes, leaders of the rival Laotian factions, meet in Geneva.

May 26—Fighting erupts in the mountain area near Padong between Pathet Lao and government troops.

At Namone, the 3 rival Laotian groups agree to establish a committee to check on areas where a cease-fire is reported.

May 27—The U.S. delegation to Geneva issues a statement in which it lists 30 violations of the cease-fire by the pro-Communists. The statement reiterates the U.S. view that the first responsibility of the conference is to effect a cease-fire.

May 31—At a plenary session of the Geneva conference, the first in a week, the delegates remain deadlocked over the question of an effective cease-fire in Laos. The Soviet Union reaffirms its unwillingness to send new orders to the I.C.C. and asks the conference to take up instead neutrality for Laos.

LEBANON

May 16—Premier Saeb Salaam resigns.

May 17—President Fouad Chehab asks Premier Salaam to form a new cabinet.

May 30—Premier Salaam receives a vote of confidence on his Cabinet in the Chamber of Deputies.

MOROCCO

May 3—It is announced that King Hassan has delegated the powers of the premiership to Ahmed Reda Guedira, director of the Royal Cabinet.

PHILIPPINES, THE

May 13—U.S. Vice-President Johnson, speaking before the Philippine Congress, declares that the U.S. will try to "preserve our position in Asia."

POLAND

May 15—Premier Jose Cyrankiewicz is un-

animously re-elected to the premiership at the opening of Poland's third postwar parliament.

PORTUGAL

Angola

May 5—Some 3,400 troops leave Portugal for Angola. *Lusitania* (Portuguese news agency) reports that Portuguese security forces have dispelled terrorists in 2 villages in northern Angola.

May 8—African terrorists attack several areas in northern Angola.

May 25—The British Foreign Secretary Lord Home, on a state visit to Portugal, urges Portugal to take steps to end the 3-month rebellion in Angola. It is disclosed that official figures reveal some 1,000 loyal Portuguese and Africans and some 8,000 rebels have been killed in the fighting.

SPAIN

May 9—West German Minister of Economics Ludwig Erhard signs an agreement in Madrid promising economic aid for Spain. Details are not released.

THAILAND

May 18—U.S. Vice-President Johnson, visiting Thailand during his mission through Southeast Asia, issues a joint communiqué with Thai Premier Sar Thanarat. The communiqué contains an offer by the U.S. to build up Thai military defenses if Communist aggression should threaten. (See also *Vietnam*.)

TUNISIA

May 5—Ending talks in Washington, Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba and U.S. President Kennedy issue a communiqué endorsing the peaceful end of colonialism and the right of other peoples to free choice in "their political attitudes."

May 19—Bourguiba meets with British Prime Minister Macmillan in London. They issue a communiqué expressing the agreement on many points.

TURKEY

May 13—President Cemal Gursel announces that last week some 140 persons were arrested for "armed resistance against the regime."

May 22—Martial law in effect in Ankara and Istanbul this past year is extended for 3 months.

May 27—The National Constituent A

sembly approves a new constitution; it will be voted on by the people.

U.S.S.R., THE

May 6—The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet proclaims that the death penalty will now be applicable to offenders who have embezzled state properties and counterfeiters. Also, a several-time criminal or one who acts violently while in confinement may be executed.

May 19—Mstislav V. Keldysh is elected president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, succeeding Aleksandr N. Nesmeyanov, who has just completed two 5-year terms of service. Keldysh is known for his work in aerodynamics and space mathematics.

May 20—Khrushchev, at a reception in honor of the persons associated with the British Trade Fair in Moscow, declares that the Soviet Union considers its "heavy industry as built," and will now give equal emphasis to light and heavy industry.

May 22—It is reported that a First Deputy Premier, Frol R. Kozlov, whom Khrushchev chose in 1959 as his successor, has suffered a heart attack and is convalescing.

May 31—Soviet Premier Khrushchev, en route to Vienna where he will meet with U.S. President Kennedy, stops in Czechoslovakia. He is greeted by Czech President Antonin Novotny.

UNITED STATES

Agriculture

May 5—Authorization for the sale of U.S. farm surpluses abroad for foreign currencies is increased by \$2 billion, in an act signed by President Kennedy.

Civil Rights

May 8—Democratic Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania and Representative Emanuel Celler of Brooklyn introduce a series of 6 civil rights bills into Congress.

May 9—White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger says that "the President has made it clear that he does not think it is necessary at this time to enact civil rights legislation."

The Economy

May 16—Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges reveals that wages and salaries, factory sales, new orders, industrial production and nonfarm jobs all increased in April.

May 25—The Labor Department reports

that the consumer price index held steady in April.

Foreign Policy

(See also *International*, *Nato*.)

May 3—President Kennedy welcomes Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba in Washington.

At a luncheon in Paris, U.S. Ambassador to France James M. Gavin is questioned about the Central Intelligence Agency's role in the Algerian generals' revolt; Gavin denies rumors that the C.I.A. was involved in the coup.

May 5—Former Vice-President Richard Nixon asks Kennedy to start "a searching reappraisal" of U.S. policy in the cold war.

May 9—The U.S. delegation to the Geneva conference on Laos begins to leave Washington. (See also *Laos*.)

May 17—Kennedy talks to the Canadian Parliament, and asks for Canadian cooperation in hemisphere affairs.

May 19—The conference between Kennedy and Soviet Premier Khrushchev is set for June 3 and 4 in Vienna; before the conference, Kennedy will meet with French President Charles de Gaulle; after the Vienna conference, Kennedy will meet with British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan in London June 5. (See also *France*.)

May 24—Kennedy asks Americans to contribute on a voluntary basis to the purchase of tractors to ransom the imprisoned Cuban rebels. (See also *Cuba*.)

Returning from an Asian goodwill tour, Vice President Lyndon Johnson says the Administration will ask for more than \$100 million extra economic and military aid for Asia. (See *Thailand* and *Vietnam*.)

May 28—Kennedy reveals that U.N. representative Adlai Stevenson will soon begin a 3-week Latin American mission.

May 29—At a Democratic dinner, Kennedy says he will not retreat or equivocate in his meeting with Khrushchev.

May 31—U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk postpones his flight to Vienna today because of the assassination of Dominican dictator Trujillo (see also *Dominican Republic*).

Government

May 1—President Kennedy signs an act to

aid areas of chronic unemployment.

The Menominee Indian Nation is freed of government stewardship.

May 2—James R. Killian Jr. is named to head the President's board supervising the activities of our foreign intelligence agency.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall notes that 15 identical bids were received by his department for electrical equipment; all bids are rejected and he notes surprise at the "identical price lists."

Udall is charged with asking an oil executive to ask his colleagues to contribute to a \$100 Democratic dinner; he denies the charge.

Kennedy reveals a 7-point program of aid for the textile industry that implies future import quotas on products from competing nations.

May 3—Congress passes a bill providing a higher minimum wage; this assures raises for some 2.5 million who must receive the \$1.25 minimum. 3.6 million more workers are covered by the new legislation.

May 5—Kennedy issues an executive order forbidding government officials from taking on outside employment or activity for private gain.

Kennedy signs the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage bill.

May 6—Robert Kennedy, Attorney General, delivers a formal address at Athens, Georgia, asking for an end to racial discrimination.

Theodore C. Achilles is named to head a new "crisis center" in the State Department.

May 8—Kennedy signs a bill providing for relief funds for needy families with children for the next 14 months.

May 11—Voting 43 to 36, the Senate authorizes Kennedy to grant aid to Eastern European satellites at his discretion.

Kennedy asks Congress to adopt a 5-year program aimed at juvenile delinquency.

May 15—The Securities and Exchange Commission reveals plans to investigate the American Stock Exchange.

May 19—Tennessee's Democratic Senator Albert Gore demands the removal of all the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Kennedy promises to select able federal

judges as he signs a law providing for an additional 73 judges.

May 25—Kennedy asks Congress for a \$1.8 billion program to speed up space technology, increase foreign aid and strengthen U.S. defenses.

May 26—Kennedy reveals that the new Federal Housing Administration ceiling on interest rates for insured mortgages is 5.5 per cent.

Kennedy offers Congress a plan to establish a single agency in charge of foreign aid programs inside the Department of State.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara emphasizes his confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

May 27—A bill providing \$600 million in special aid for Latin America is signed by Kennedy.

May 28—John G. Tower wins a Senate seat in Texas, defeating Democratic interim appointee William A. Blakley. Tower will be the first Republican senator from Texas since Reconstruction.

May 29—The Atomic Energy Commission reduces nuclear fuel prices by 40 per cent.

Kennedy asks Congress to set up a training program to help the unemployed and those who need new skills.

Labor

May 16—An agreement to enter a mutual aid pact between the International Longshoremen's Association and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and the National Maritime Union is cancelled by the Longshoremen's executive council. According to AFL-CIO rules, no union is allowed to ally with Hoffa's Teamsters Union.

May 19—A U.S. District Court finds the United Mine Workers guilty of violating terms of the Sherman Antitrust Act by conspiring with coal companies to monopolize the bituminous coal industry.

President Kennedy invokes the Railway Labor Act to force a 60-day delay of a threatened nation-wide walkout by the 5,000 members of the Railroad Yardmasters of America.

May 26—Labor and management pledge no strike, no lockout policy at top priority missile and space bases; a Missile Site Labor Commission is established by the President.

Military Policy

May 3—In the first launching from underground, the Air Force launches a Titan I missile from a 146-foot deep hole.

May 4—After a record balloon flight to 21.5 miles above earth, a Navy balloonist is drowned while being retrieved.

May 5—Alan B. Shepard, Jr., a Navy test pilot, rockets 115 miles into space and lands safely in good condition. Shepard, the first American to travel in space, piloted his own craft during the flight.

Roy K. Davenport, a manpower specialist in the office of the adjutant general, is appointed special assistant for personnel to Army Undersecretary Stephen Ailes. Davenport is a Negro.

May 7—The Defense Department warns the Air Force to refrain from wasteful labor-management practices in missile base construction.

May 8—Senator John McClellan tells reporters that Kennedy plans an Executive Order to cope with missile base strikers and slow-downs.

A new long-range Polaris missile is launched and flies over 1600 miles from Cape Canaveral.

May 9—U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk promises five Polaris nuclear missile submarines to Nato's naval forces.

May 12—The Pentagon reveals that new classification criteria have been introduced to protect the intelligence-gathering techniques of the nation.

May 22—Kennedy names General Curtis E. LeMay as Air Force Chief of Staff, succeeding General Thomas D. White.

May 31—The Pentagon announces that the DEW line (radar and electronic anti-aircraft screen in Northeast Canada) has been extended eastward to Greenland.

Politics

May 8—It is reported by *The New York Times* that Richard Maguire, and Richard Donahue, patronage assistants to the President, are meeting at the White House with New York politician Michael H. Prendergast to end a conflict between Prendergast and the Administration over patronage distribution in the state of New York.

Segregation

May 3—John W. Winters is elected to the Raleigh City Council in Raleigh, North Carolina; he is the first Negro ever to serve

on the Council.

May 4—Julius LeVonne Chambers is named editor-in-chief of *The North Carolina Law Review*; he is the first Negro student to win the highest honor at the University of North Carolina Law School. Chambers leads his class scholastically.

May 10—In a run-off election, T. D. Armstrong is the first Negro to be elected to the Galveston City Council, Galveston, Texas.

May 11—Georgia Tech reveals it has chosen 3 Negro students for admission in the fall to the previously all-white engineering school.

May 15—Two buses carrying Negro and white members of the Congress of Racial Equality are attacked as they tour Alabama to try to force an end to segregated facilities in bus stations. The "Freedom Riders" plan to drive through the deep South in a nonviolent demonstration.

May 16—It is reported from Washington that Attorney General Robert Kennedy has asked the Metropolitan Club in Washington to eliminate its discrimination against Negroes.

May 18—Eight Negro and two white students are jailed in Birmingham, Alabama, for trying to end racial discrimination in bus stations.

Circuit Judge Walter B. Jones enjoins the "Freedom Riders" from testing segregated bus station facilities in Alabama.

May 20—"Freedom Riders" are attacked by a mob of white rioters in Montgomery; at least 20 persons have been injured.

U.S. marshals are sent to Alabama by the Department of Justice to restore order; a Justice Department spokesman says that some 350-400 federal law officers are being sent to insure safe passage in interstate commerce.

May 21—Governor Patterson proclaims martial law in Montgomery after a white mob riots in front of a Negro church where a mass meeting led by Martin Luther King is in progress.

May 22—In Montgomery, the National Guard keeps order under martial law.

The Congress of Racial Equality says the "Freedom Ride" through Alabama will be resumed if possible. Another group of "Freedom Riders" is traveling from Tennessee to New Orleans.

May 23—Robert Kennedy says federal mar-

shals will remain in Alabama only as long as they are needed.

May 24—27 "Freedom Riders" are jailed in Jackson, Mississippi; they have been accompanied from Montgomery, Alabama, by armed escort.

Police officials in Birmingham and Montgomery, Alabama, are enjoined by the Department of Justice from interfering with interstate travel.

Robert Kennedy asks for a "cooling off period" on the part of the "Freedom Riders"; they refuse.

Another group of "Freedom Riders" including the Yale University chaplain arrive in Montgomery.

In New Orleans, 10 Nazis wearing swastikas and uniforms conducting a "hate campaign" against Negroes and Jews are arrested.

May 25—Martin Luther King, speaking for groups supporting the movement, refuses to stop the "Freedom Rides" despite continuing violence.

Only 100 U.S. marshals are left in Alabama; 566 are withdrawn by the Justice Department.

May 26—In Mississippi, 27 "Freedom Riders" are fined and receive suspended jail sentences.

May 28—Two new groups of "Freedom Riders" are jailed in Mississippi; a total of 44 "Freedom Riders" have been jailed in the past five days.

May 29—Governor Patterson proclaims the end of martial law in Montgomery.

17 "Freedom Riders" are fined and given suspended jail sentences in Mississippi.

May 30—The Alabama Court of Appeals upholds the conviction of 12 Negroes guilty of sit-down demonstrations.

The Southern Regional Council says that to prevent the rise of "real, genuine extremists," Southern whites must grant the desire of the Freedom Riders for change in segregation customs.

Federal Judge Irving R. Kaufman rules that the New Rochelle (New York) Lincoln elementary school segregates Negro children unconstitutionally. He charges the New Rochelle Board of Education with initiating "officially created segregation." The judge orders that the Board of Education must permit Negro students at

Lincoln to transfer to other schools.

Supreme Court

May 1—The Supreme Court refuses to review district court rulings that the state of Alabama must produce voting records for the U.S. Attorney General in accord with the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

May 8—The Court affirms a lower court decision that Louisiana legislation denying the New Orleans school board control of school funds and vesting school control in the Legislature is invalid.

May 15—Overruling a 15-year old decision (the Wilcox case), the Court rules that the future embezzlers must report fraudulent gains on their income tax returns. Splitting 4 ways, the Court produces a clear majority opinion.

May 22—The Court rules that the state of Louisiana cannot force the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Peoples to disclose the names of members and contributors.

Voting 4 to 3, the Court rules that E. I. du Pont de Nemours within 10 years must dispose of its holdings in General Motors estimated at almost \$3 billion. Action must begin promptly.

May 29—E. I. du Pont de Nemours asks the Court to waive its insistence on a 10-year deadline for disposal of General Motors stock, and to ask the Chicago Federal District Court to study the problem and set a time limit.

The Court votes 8 to 1 to uphold state blue laws forbidding business and commercial activities on Sunday.

VIETNAM, SOUTH

May 11—U.S. Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson arrives in South Vietnam.

May 13—A joint communiqué by Johnson and President Ngo is released, showing that the 2 leaders have reached agreement on an 8-point program for military and economic aid to Vietnam.

May 17—Vietnam reports renewed Communist guerrilla activity.

May 18—U.S. officials report that the U.S. has helped build up Thailand's and Vietnam's border defenses to prevent Communist infiltration from Laos.

May 29—A cabinet reorganization is announced; 3 "superministries" are created which will take precedence in the cabinet.

These **CURRENT HISTORY** issues are available for quantity purchase

Use this check list to order for your classes . . .

Problems in World Affairs

- Foreign Aid and Foreign Policy (9/57)
- The World of Islam (6/57)
- Canada (7/55)
- The Mediterranean World (8/55)
- The Far East in the Free World (7/56)
- Tensions in the British Community (6/58)
- Tensions in East-Central Europe (4/59)
- France and the Fifth Republic (5/59)
- Government and Labor Abroad (8/59)
- American Foreign Policy and the Communist World (10/59)
- Russian Foreign Policy and the Western World (11/59)
- Communist China as a World Power (12/59)
- West Germany as a World Power (1/60)
- U. S. Military Policy and World Security (4/60)
- Progress in the Middle East (5/60)
- World Federalism and Free World Security (8/60)
- West Europe and Continuing Coexistence (1/61)
- Nations of Latin America (4/61)
- Government and Education Abroad (6/61)

Problems of American Democracy

- United States Through Foreign Eyes (12/56)
- American Farm Leaders (6/55)
- Disarmament and Defense (10/57)
- Changing American Politics (8/56)
- Public Power in the U. S. (5/58)
- Security in a Free Society (10/55)
- Immigration and the American Ideal (11/55)
- Government and Labor in the U. S. (9/59)
- The American Economy (7/60)
- Regionalism in the U. S. (5/61)
- Government and Education in the U.S. (7/61)

Coming Soon

- Current Problems of American Education (8/61)
- China (9/61)
- Africa (10/61)
- The Soviet Union (11/61)
- South Asia (12/61)
- Foreign Policy of the Kennedy Administration (1/62)

Our Special Group Rates . . .

Because these studies are so helpful, we are now offering them at special reduced rates for group use: In orders of 5 or more copies of different issues, copies are available at 65¢ each; in orders of 5 or more copies of the same issue, at 50¢ each; 10 or more of the same issue, at 45¢; 30 or more of the same issue, at 40¢ each; 100 or more of the same issue, at 35¢ a copy. Single copy price, 85¢.

We also offer reduced rates for student subscriptions: in orders of 10 subscriptions or more, your students may subscribe for 9 months at \$4.05; or for 12 months at \$5.40; in orders of 30 or more, our 9 month rate is \$3.60; 12 months, \$4.80; in orders of 100 or more, our 9 month rate is \$3.15 and our 12 month rate is \$4.20. The cost of a single subscription is \$5.25 for 9 months; \$7.50 a year. See our special introductory offer on reverse side.

CURRENT HISTORY

1822 Ludlow Street

Philadelphia 3, Penna.

CH 761-3

I understand that I may order copies of these coordinated issues in quantity at special reduced rates. Please send me the issues I have indicated, in the quantities I have marked.

Name ☐ Check enclosed ☐ Bill me
Address ☐ 1 Year \$7.50 ☐ 2 Years \$14
City State plus 3 free issues plus 3 free issues

Keep Up To Date!

See what a **CURRENT HISTORY** subscription offers **YOU!**

****Month after month, our timely studies will keep you informed on vital topics.**

INTERESTING and KNOWLEDGEABLE REPORTS will round out your background information on such crucial matters as . . .

**FREE WORLD SECURITY
AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY
PROGRESS IN THE MIDDLE EAST
GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION
ABROAD**

**RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY
THE COLD WAR
THE AMERICAN ECONOMY
WEST GERMANY AS A WORLD
POWER**

Subscribe now to **CURRENT HISTORY**. **EXCLUSIVE AND ORIGINAL STUDIES** will provide you with invaluable, factual material that you can rely on for accuracy. Nowhere is such material duplicated. Nowhere are similar studies available at such low cost. **CURRENT HISTORY's** continuing reference volumes are *one-of-a-kind!*

COORDINATED ISSUES contain seven or eight articles each month devoted to a pertinent topic in world affairs. Each of our contributors is a specialist in his field, who brings you his first-hand knowledge, background, impressions. Each article in an issue focuses on a different aspect of the subject for complete coverage of the complex problems of today's world.

CHRONOLOGY — The Month in Review offers a day-by-day account of the important events in all the countries of the world, both large and small. This is the only monthly chronology of its kind being published in the United States.

DOCUMENTS — Our documents section reprints the texts of important treaties, laws, diplomatic notes, speeches, to provide original source material. See how this material increases your understanding of how history is made.

BOOK REVIEWS — Comments on current books of interest to our readers bring you concise notes evaluating the latest publications in the field of history and politics.

AS A SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY BONUS, we will give you 3 free issues. Today, as Americans travel throughout the world, their need for background information on the problems of our century has increased one-hundred-fold. Concerned citizens everywhere are awakening to the fact that they must be prepared to meet ever-growing demands upon their insight and understanding.

3 FREE ISSUES

Your subscription to **CURRENT HISTORY** will include three coordinated studies **FREE**—Chosen from our List of Available Issues (see reverse side)—plus the next 12 issues for the usual yearly subscription price. Don't forget to select your 3 free gift copies from our list on the other side of this cover!

A GIFT FOR YOU WORTH \$2.55 *Sign up today!*

From **CURRENT HISTORY** • 1822 Ludlow Street • Phila. 3, Pa.

Name Address

City Zone State

Send me the following 3 gift copies:

☐ 12 months at \$7.50
plus 3 free issues

☐ 24 months at \$14
plus 3 free issues

☐ Check enclosed
☐ Bill me

Add 25¢ for Canada; 75¢ for foreign, including the Philippines.

CH 761-4